

BACONIANA.

VOL. XVIII. *Third Series.* MARCH, 1925. No. 68.

It should be clearly understood that the Bacon Society does not hold itself responsible for the views expressed by contributors to "Baconiana."

THE 364TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER.

THE ANNUAL DINNER was again held at Stewart's Restaurant, Piccadilly, where a company of over sixty members and guests assembled, presided over by the President, the Hon. Sir John Cockburn, K.C.M.G. Among the guests were Lady Sydenham, Sir Edgar Wigram, Bart., the Rev. Prebendary Gough, Mme. Francois Millet, Dr. Charles Moor, D.D., F.S.A., Dr. F. Chamberlain, LL.B., F.R.H.S., F.S.A., and Mr. E. P. Hewitt, K.C., LL.D.

At the conclusion of the Dinner, the toast of The King having been duly honoured, the Chairman proposed: "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon."

He said they had met to do honour to the memory of the greatest Englishman that had ever lived, Francis Bacon. Some day that anniversary would be celebrated by great gatherings wherever the English language was spoken, and he advised them to keep their programmes, because when Bacon came to his own—and this event was rapidly approaching—the programme would be of value. It would show that those who belonged to the Society had upheld the fame and the memory of the great man they were proud to call their

2 The 364th Anniversary Dinner

master. (Hear, hear.) It might be said that Bacon was always with them; they thought his thoughts, and his words hung upon their lips, and references to him were frequently made in the daily papers and of every branch of literature; yet there were some who were not aware that great as Bacon's intellect was, his moral qualities excelled even those of his intellect. He was indeed not only the wisest and the greatest, but the best of men. He was noted for his generosity, which in him was almost a failing. Referring to Pope's line, "The wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind," he said that the word meanest was a lie and a libel yet an extraordinary superstructure had been built upon the line. Just like the scorpion, its sting was in its tail. Macaulay, in his *Life of Lord Bacon*, showed up his high lights by a black background, irrespective altogether of the truth. The Chairman proceeded to deal with other aspersions on the character of Bacon, more particularly the charge that he was unfaithful in his friendship with the Earl of Essex. On the contrary, it was the latter who was unfaithful. As counsel to the Crown, Bacon could not help himself; he had his duty to perform and there was no ground for the silly statement that he acted treacherously towards Essex. With reference to the charge of improperly receiving gifts, they were to be regarded as the ordinary perquisites of that day, and when he became Lord Chancellor he found it was impossible to avoid the custom. It was said that these gifts were only given to his servants and he could have cleared himself of the charge with the greatest ease. The law was never to his taste, for in its practice he found no scope for his genius. England had never honoured Bacon as he should have been honoured, and it remained for them to right his memory and to do justice to his character. (Applause.) It was an

honour to belong to a Society which had this great object in view, and in conclusion he asked the company to drink to the immortal memory of Lord Bacon.

Mr. H. Crouch Batchelor, in responding, expressed his interest in the Society and its object. He said he was particularly concerned in the mysterious question, "Who wrote Shakespeare?" If the uncultured person to whom the works were attributed was the author of what was the most splendid literature in the world, then it was a miracle, and the Scriptural miracles must take a back seat. (Laughter.) There were present a number of guests, and he hoped that some of them would be converted. Bacon was the greatest of all dramatists, and he (the speaker) wanted Shakspeare to be wiped out. (Laughter.)

The Rev. Prebendary Gough, who proposed the Toast of the Bacon Society, said it was a duty to recover the proper place for one of the greatest intellects that the English race had produced. This great man's name had had blotches thrown upon it which were absolutely unjust. Bacon was one of the noblest writers of the noblest race on earth, and the Society was doing good work by presenting him as he really was.

Captain W. Gundry responded, and in thanking Prebendary Gough for his noble tribute to Bacon, reminded his hearers that when the great Lord Chancellor's case was adjudicated before the House of Lords the Bishops without exception had fought for him and had, in particular, opposed the suggested deprivation of temporal honours (for immortal ones were beyond the power of his enemies). The speaker went on to point out that Bacon realised that he was "fitter to hold a book than play a part," and drew attention to Bacon's association of books and ships, and navigation and printing, in his writings.

4 The 364th Anniversary Dinner

The speaker mentioned those two beacon (or Bacon) lights of the largely uncharted sea of Literature, *Cruden's Concordance* for the *Bible*, and *Cowden-Clarke's Concordance* for *Shakespeare*, and expressed the wish that there was a similar work of reference with which to study Bacon's works. He went on to suggest that a "Baconian Concordance" should be undertaken by the Society and that the results of the work should be published from time to time in *BACONIANA* until the time came to gather up their labours and put it into book form.

It may be added that Capt. Gundry had in mind the suggestion for a Concordance for which Professor G. Curtis of Bethlehem University, Pa., U.S.A., who has already made a beginning on this work.

The Toast of the "Visitors" was proposed by Mr. Francis Udny in a few well-chosen words and the Rev. C. Moor, D.D., F.S.A., returned thanks for the visitors and gave some account of his examination of the Bacon deeds remaining at Gorhambury. The present Countess of Verulam, he said, being much interested in the history of the Grimston family, from the senior line of which he happened to be himself descended, had asked him to examine and put in order the large collection of family deeds, which had accumulated during many generations, and during the last year he had spent much time at Gorhambury, engaged upon this work. The deeds, he found, were a good deal mixed, and concerned many other properties besides Gorhambury, and up to the present he had scarcely examined half the collection. It would therefore seem wise at the present juncture to refer only to a few of the most important concerning the Bacon family, and to reserve a full report until the examination was complete.

Gorhambury came to the Grimston family by pur-

chase, Sir Harbottle Grimston, Bart., Master of the Rolls, having bought it from the trustees of Sir Henry Meautys on 16th April, 1652. Sir Samuel Grimston left his estate to his nephew William Luckyn, who took his name, and was created Viscount Grimston in 1719. The fourth Viscount was made Earl of Verulam in 1815.

As regards Gorhambury and its dependent manors of Westwick and Praye, Lady Ann (*née* Cooke) widow of Sir Nicholas Bacon, the Lord Keeper, held the property for life, and resided there until her death in 1610. In 1602, however, "for love of her son Francis and for his advancement," she surrendered her life interest to him. Sir Nicholas Bacon, his eldest half-brother and the legal heir of his father, had surrendered to the Queen in 1601 all his rights and reversions to (his father's) lands in Herts., and in 1608 the King gave the reversion of the same to the trustees of Francis.

In 1606 we have the Marriage Settlement of Sir Francis Bacon and Alice Barnham, an interesting document. In 1621 the King granted to four persons named the Fine of £40,000 which Parliament had laid upon Bacon, giving them full powers to recover it from Bacon's property, with the assistance of the Court of Chancery. The most interesting Bacon document, however, which has yet been found, is a decree of the same Court, 12th June, 1632, which recites the various proceedings and actions concerning the creditors and the estates that had taken place since the death of Bacon, and which finally settles the disposition of the property. Suffice it to say that in accordance with Bacon's will the estates were sold for the benefit of the creditors to trustees named by Sir Thomas Meautys, who supplied the money. Alice (*née* Barnham) was a consenting party, and received

6 The 364th Anniversary Dinner

for life an annuity of £530, which had been settled upon her.

There are many other interesting deeds, and particularly some which throw light upon the marital relations of Alice with her second husband, Sir John Underhill, but at present we need refer only to one. In 1630 Thomas Bacon of Hessel, who at Bacon's Inquisition had been found to be his heir at law, renounced all his rights in Gorhambury, etc., to the trustees of Sir Thomas Meautys, previously to their sale. Who exactly was Thomas, and how did he come to be the heir at law?

The Chairman then called upon Madame Millet, who read the following greeting from Général Cartier, the famous cryptographer and President of the Bacon Society of France.

"A Greeting to the Bacon Society of Great Britain from Général Cartier, President of the Bacon Society of France.

"I am happy to have the opportunity, afforded by Madame François Millet's visit to London, to send my sympathetic greetings to the Bacon Society of Great Britain and to its distinguished President, Sir John A. Cockburn, and its members on the occasion of the Commemoration of the 364th Anniversary of the Birth of Francis Bacon.

"When I speak of the Bacon Society of France I am aware that I anticipate somewhat, because the Société is not yet regularly constituted. Your great Bacon is not well known in France, rather he is misjudged. His philosophical works are assuredly known by the learned and by historians as well as his career as a statesman—but the misunderstanding brought about by the iniquitous judgment which saddened his last years has obscured for many of my compatriots the glory with which his name should have shone

forth. And more, the opinion remains sceptical with regard to works which he has written under other names than his own—of which the immortal masterpieces attributed to Shakespeare are the most celebrated. The partisans of the actor from Stratford-on-Avon diminish from year to year, and at last it is recognised and admitted that the name of Shakespeare should no longer figure on the title-page of the folio of 1623.

“ But the controversy continues when we are called upon to designate the genius who was constrained to dissimulate his identity under a borrowed name.

“ The Conferences which I have delivered at the Lyceum Club of Paris and at the Group Parisian of the École Polytechnique have aroused great curiosity and shaken many convictions. I have the proof in the voluminous correspondence—several thousands of letters, as a result of my series of articles in the revue *le Mercure de France*, in 1922, on the remarkable and beautiful work of Mrs. Gallup verified by Colonel G. Fabyan of the American Secret Service and his learned specialists in cryptography, who work at Riverbank in the State of Ohio. It was at the close of one of my Conferences that certain members of my audience spontaneously proposed that we should found a Bacon Society in France, which would seek to gather from old libraries, private collections and ancient editions, allusions and documents regarding Bacon to save them from oblivion and to convince the undecided.

“ The important results of the researches of the Societies of Great Britain and of America have been a powerful stimulant and example of what we should try to accomplish in France.

“ I am very grateful to the President and members of the two sister societies for the encouragement they have given me and the documents they have had the kindness to send me for my Society. I beg Mme.

8 The 364th Anniversary Dinner

Millet to express my sincere thanks and those of my adherents to the Honourable Sir John A. Cockburn for his courtesy in writing me, and particularly to Miss Alicia Leith, whose visit to Paris and whose very interesting conference, which I had the honour of translating into French, produced a profound impression. I hope that the moment is not far off when our branch of the Society shall be definitely formed, when we also can produce in a French *Baconiana* the results of our own researches and thus contribute to the proclaiming of the truth and aid in rendering justice to the man who should be the pride and glory of all humanity, very specially in France, where he had lived and where according to his deciphered autobiography he had loved. Long live the Bacon Society of Great Britain, and a Happy New Year to all its members is the sincere wish of

“GÉNÉRAL CARTIER.”

Loud applause greeted Mme. Millet, after which the President called upon Mr. Percy Hewitt, K.C. After expressing his appreciation for having received an invitation, Mr. Hewitt referred to a statement by Mr. Crouch Batchelor that some people in this country seemed determined to defame Bacon; he thought that Mr. Crouch Batchelor went to the other extreme and appeared determined to defame Shakespeare, but justice should be done all round. Commenting on the prosecution of Essex, he said that in his view Bacon, as Attorney General, could not have refused to prosecute under the Queen's directions, although this left open the question whether in the conduct of the trial Bacon displayed any unnecessary severity or bitterness.

As regards the taking of gifts or bribes, it was fair to bear in mind that the acceptance of gifts by persons holding official positions was not an uncommon practice in Bacon's day and later, and they were regarded as in the nature of perquisites. He expressed the view that so far as Bacon's memory may have been placed under a cloud undeservedly, it was the interest and duty of his countrymen to see that any undeserved imputation was removed. In this matter, and in that of the authorship of

the Plays, the great thing was to ascertain by careful research the truth.

The Toast of The Ladies' Guild of Francis St. Alban was proposed by Sir Edgar Wigram, Bart., who said he had great pleasure in doing so because of the gratitude of his Archæological Society of St. Alban's to Miss Alicia Leith and others for working so hard and collecting the sum of fifty-three pounds from the members of the Guild to save the Monument of Lord St. Alban in St. Michael's, Gorhambury, from utter collapse, the perishing of the bricks below it having threatened the disaster. The Toast was responded to by Miss Alicia Leith, who took for her subject the recent splendid production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* at Drury Lane, by Mr. Basil Dean, *a Masque*, with Ancient Wisdom behind it, a study of which she promised would be forthcoming at the next meeting of the Guild, and in the March number of *Fly-Leaves*.

The Officers of the Society.—Mr. Horace Nickson paid a tribute to the President and Council of the Society, the Hon. Secretary, Mrs. Teresa Dexter, on her dexterous handling of the work of the Society, and of the work of the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Henry Wood, whose excellent work he would like to see aided by larger donations and an increasing membership. Passing to the growth both in and out of the Society of our aims, he spoke of the growing disbelief in the Shakespearean authorship of the Plays penetrating into the very stronghold of Stratford itself; living near and constantly piloting parties to the place, his belief was that the edifice raised by the Stratfordians was getting very shaky.

The Hon. Secretary, in responding, expressed her thanks to all concerned for their able co-operation, and spoke of the growth of the idea of the Baconian authorship in other countries, and the increasing activity in the year lying behind them. Uphill as the work was, a band of Pioneers they took unto themselves, Henrik Ibsen's great saying that the "Majority were always in the wrong."

The Hon. Treasurer said, having never made a speech in her life, she felt she would not begin at this late hour in the proceedings but wish them all a hearty good-night.

T. D.

WHO WAS SHAKESPEARE ?

BY BASIL E. LAWRENCE, LL.D.

EVERYONE who reads carefully the Shakespeare plays and the commentaries on them must be struck by two points, namely, first the diversity of style, and second, that the vocabulary is phenomenal.

Some portions of the plays are as fine as anything that has ever been written in the English language, others are very inferior, and some of them almost beneath contempt. It does not seem possible that the man who wrote the ribaldry that is found in some of the plays could have written Hamlet's Soliloquy, Jaques' speech on the life of Man, or Portia's plea for mercy. This diversity of style is to be found not only in different plays but also in one and the same play. Take, for example, the play of Troilus and Cressida. The man who wrote the vulgar abuse of Patroclus and Thersides could not have written the speeches of Ulysses.

Max Muller estimated the vocabulary of a man of average education at 3,000 words, that of Milton at 7,000 words, and that of Shakespeare at 15,000. Professor Craik puts the vocabulary of Shakespeare still higher, namely at 21,000 words. Now it does not seem possible that any one man could have had a vocabulary seven times that of a man of average education and three times that of Milton.

The diversity of style and the phenomenal vocabulary are an insurmountable difficulty to those who claim that the Shakespeare plays, that we now have, were written in their entirety by any one man.

The difficulty can, however, be explained by a view

that has been recently brought forward ; namely, that the plays we now have consist of existing plays written in collaboration by such men as Drayton, Dekker, Chettle, Heywood, Porter, Webster and Munday, and revised by a master mind. It is claimed that in this revision the Master mind left in some of the original writing, touched up and improved other parts, added writings of his own, and thus made the Shakespeare plays what they now are. If this view is correct, then in the Shakespeare plays we have the style and the vocabulary not of one man but of several men, and the difficulty vanishes. Critics have found writing in the style of the above-mentioned collaborators and others in several of the plays. In Henslowe's Diary, plays with titles similar to those of some of the Shakespeare plays are mentioned and the names of their authors are given ; but the name Shakespeare is not mentioned anywhere.

Certain literary critics have rejected some of the Shakespeare plays as not being Shakespearean ; but the handiwork of the master mind can be found in all of them. Moreover, there is this to be considered. The First Folio was published in 1623 and it was claimed that it contained the works of Shakespeare. The editor, there can be little doubt, was Ben Jonson. Ben Jonson was a clever man, and must have known what he was about and what he had to do. He might have left something out, but he would not have put in any play unless he had been certain that Shakespeare had had something to do with it, however little that something might have been. If anybody has a theory as to who Shakespeare was, and in order to prove it has to reject any of the plays that are contained in the First Folio, then, although he may have identified one of the authors of the plays that the Master mind revised, he has not found Shakespeare. It is quite

possible that this is what Mr. Looney has done in his theory as to Edward de Vere.

The question is, who was the person responsible for the plays that we now have and who was the reviser who had the Master mind.

A perusal of the plays shows that he must have been an aristocrat who had little sympathy with the lower classes, that he was a Latin and Greek scholar, a French and Italian linguist, a lawyer, a man who knew a great deal about the science of the time, a philosopher, and apparently a broad-minded protestant, that he was accustomed to Court life, and had great poetical gifts. If the above-mentioned view is correct, he must also have been a man accustomed to the frequent revision of his writings. There was but one man at the time that fulfilled all these requisites, and he was Francis Bacon.

Bacon had been accustomed to Court life from his infancy and had little sympathy with the lower classes. He was a lawyer, a scholar, and a linguist, and had travelled in France and Italy. He was a broad-minded protestant, a scientist and a philosopher. He was a great reviser, and revised his acknowledged writings over and over again. He had poetical gifts, for he wrote Masques for Gray's Inn, and there can be little doubt that he was the author of *Venus and Adonis* and of *Lucrece*. He referred to himself as a poet, and was regarded by his contemporaries as a great poet. After his death a number of eulogies were published in which he was praised as the greatest poet of the day, and in one of them it was stated that he incorporated his philosophy in Comedies and Tragedies. He fits in everywhere with the qualities that the plays show the person responsible for them must have had.

But in addition to this there are several other things that point to Bacon.

He had many unusual philosophical views, some of which appeared in the plays, and some of which appeared in the plays long before they were made public in his acknowledged writings. For example, unusual views as to Love, his philosophy of Wonder, his remarks on Hope, and his method of obtaining comfort by contemplation.

There are certain errors in his acknowledged writings, and some of these errors appear in the plays. Some of these errors he corrected, and they were also corrected in the plays, a few of these corrections in his acknowledged writings and in the plays being made at the same time.

Again, there are certain passages in the plays that there can be little doubt refer to his fall in 1621. None of these passages appeared in the plays until the First Folio was published in 1623.

The use made by the person responsible for the plays of Bacon's note book, *The Promus*, is so well known that it need not be mentioned, except to remark that Mrs. Pott in her book on the subject may have overdrawn some of her examples, but no effort has ever been made to upset her general deductions.

Bacon, in the preface to his History of Henry VII., commended the elaboration of existing literary work, inasmuch as it saved time and labour. His view was that the labours of a writer were much easier if he had, ready to work on, "a simple narrative of the actions themselves, which should only have needed to be enriched with counsels and speeches and notable particularities." Bacon was a great orator, was great at "counsels and speeches," and had a multifarious knowledge of "notable particularities." It is claimed that in the Shakespeare plays he added these "counsels," "speeches," and "notable particularities," to the writings of other men. Rawley says that he

"clothed the thoughts of others in more beautiful garbs." The Shakespeare plays are to a great extent "the thoughts of others" clothed "in more beautiful garbs," and they are examples of the kind of writing that Bacon commended.

Considerable portions of the Shakespeare plays are written in Bacon's style of writing.

But it may be asked : If Bacon was responsible for the plays how was it that everybody acknowledged Shaksper of Stratford to be the author ? The answer is that everybody did not acknowledge Shaksper of Stratford to be the author. No doubt the general public may have thought he was the author, but there were several men, such as Ben Jonson, Bishop Hall, and John Marston, who knew perfectly well what part Bacon had taken in the plays, and have told us so, as far as it was safe for them to do so.

That the plays were attributed to Shaksper of Stratford can be explained as follows. He was a purveyor of plays for his company of actors. He procured certain plays that were acted by his company, and as they had been procured by him they were produced under his name, and so were believed by the general public to have been written by him. If at the present time we see a play that is stated to have been written by a certain person, we take the statement for granted, and do not enquire whether that certain person is the real author or not. Playgoers in the time of Elizabeth and James would have done the same.

Halliwell-Phillipps gives several verses that he seems to think refer to Shaksper of Stratford personally ; but they apply to Shakespeare the author, which is a very different matter. There are certainly two verses in existence that refer to Shaksper of Stratford ; but they refer to him only as an actor. The Burbages, in their petition to the Lord Chamberlain, also refer to him personally, and they describe him as a "deserving man" and a "man player." But it is not necessary to say more about Shaksper of Stratford, for the writings of Sir George Greenwood have completely swept away the Stratfordian myth.

THE ETERNAL CONTROVERSY ABOUT SHAKESPEARE.

[A Lecture by HOFKAT WEBER-EBENHOFF, on the Bacon Problem, reported in the *Neues Wiener Journal*, November 11th, 1924.]

THE dispute as to the personality of Shakespeare does not seem to be over. After the great anathema which was hurled by the Shakespeare Society in Weimar against the Bacon story, both parties have been apparently silent. But now the question is again opened and further results have been announced. At the last meeting of the Shakespeare (Austrian) Society, Hofkat Weber-Ebenhoff gave a lecture in which he surveyed the work of the last five years.

"The development of Shakespeare investigation in favour of Bacon has made remarkable progress during the last two years, in western Europe, as well as in England and America. A new Bacon Society has been founded in New York under the presidency of Mr. Willard Parker. In Holland, Dr. Speckman, a professor of Philology, has been specially active and has rendered good service to Science through the discovery of the Bacon Ciphers in the famous pseudonymous cryptographic work of GUSTAVUS SELENUS of 1624, republished with the folio edition of the plays in 1623. Dr. Celestin Demblon, Professor of Philology in the University of Brussels, and author of a most interesting work on Shakespeare, which proves in a striking manner the impossibility of the Stratford theory as to the authorship of the plays, has also done very good work. In Paris a 'Société Baconienne de France,' before which lies a great future, has been

16 Controversy about Shakespeare

founded. But, if research in the Western Countries has progressed, the same cannot be said of Central and Eastern Europe.

"In Germany and in Austria the disastrous influence of the German Shakespeare Society in Weimar reigns with absolute authority, and since the anathema which it hurled against Bacon research in 1895 it still clings to its opinions although its influence has been long surpassed by the immense development of Bacon literature, and the foundation of Bacon Societies all over the world. This influence of the Weimar Society is the more disastrous because it represents a very strong organisation which includes all official School Teachers and School Institutions which are sworn to destroy, if possible, all Bacon research. No student can take a degree, or read a thesis, with any hope of success until he blindly subscribes to the myth which names the butcher-boy of Stratford as the author and composer of the greatest works of all nations and of all times. Such only can become professors or teachers at schools and colleges, and any others are ruthlessly thrust aside. It is high time that this crippling of free opinion in scientific research should cease. Ever since 1864, an annual meeting takes place, at which festival lectures on the Stratford theory are delivered and published in the Society's *Year Books*.

"The Austrian Society has been trying to get a reply published in its own *Year Book*, but has been hindered. Professor Emil Wolff's lecture was announced as 'The so-called Shakespeare-Bacon Investigation' and the Bacon Society was provoked and tried to get up a defence. On March 19th, 1924, a letter asked for a lecture in favour of Bacon, and the request was refused. No free discussion was allowed and the invitation to Weimar was not accepted. The lecture by Professor Wolff has appeared in the *Year Book*, pp. 59-60,

and gives a deplorable example of the entire collapse of the so-called Stratford-Shakespeare Science and exposes it to the ridicule of the scientific and educated world. It is a sad thing that German Science which is doing such good work in all other departments should be exposed in this way. The explanations given by Professor Wolff in his lecture and in his book *Francis Bacon und seine Quellen* are all directed against modern science and modern philosophic thought and aim directly at a return to antiquity and scholasticism, and all natural science as well as technical science is treated with contempt.

"Professor Wolff's lecture is founded on the idea that the existence of the Stratford Shakspeare has been proved beyond all doubt by documents which testify to his birth, his marriage and death; and that the dramas were published under his name; that until Delia Bacon came forward in 1849, no one doubted that the man of Stratford was the author of the plays; that as the man was recognised by his contemporaries there is no reason to accept the Bacon theory. But Bacon's position to-day is so sure that it is difficult to understand how anyone at all acquainted with the subject can hold the contrary opinion."

FRANCIS BACON'S ANTICIPATION OF WIRELESS.

"And those musicians that shall play to you,
Hang in the air a thousand leagues from hence;
And straight they shall be here: sit and attend."

King Henry IV., Part I., Act 3, Scene 1.

SHAKESPEARE'S "AUGMENTATIONS."

BY J. R. (OF GRAY'S INN).

THERE are many theories as to the authorship of the Plays in the rare First Folio entitled "Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies." Most people believe that he wrote them. Successive editors have had no doubt that he did so. Many careful investigators are sure that he did not. Some have lately given reasons in the *National Review* for attributing the plays to dramatists other than Shakespeare, and rejecting the Stratfordian theory which is founded on him alone. Let me venture another theory on this subject of much controversy. Preface is needed. We hear a good deal nowadays about the "sense of humour" possessed by the English. It, like other senses, varies in degree from a very common to a very keen perception of the ludicrous. All classes of spectators at a theatre have to be amused, although their taste and intelligence greatly differ. Plays of "Shakespeare," both comedies and tragedies, generally contain scenes of low-comic kind. Some are still amusing to everybody. Some must always have "made the judicious grieve," some may have been introduced to relieve the tension of the plot, or for change of scenery, or, as is most likely, to tickle "the ears of the groundlings" by coarse phrase and lewd suggestion.

It is in the scenes of low comedy that the references to Warwickshire places and names are supposed to be found on which stress is laid by those who argue that the actor from Stratford composed the plays. Biographers, commentators, and critics, with all their

pains, have failed to prove that he was a man of good education and character. The material that they have sifted so thoroughly seems to shew the contrary. On the other hand it appears from that material and from his undoubted prosperity that, although lacking education and character, he was a sharp fellow and rose in life as such men so often do. This is a fact which those who deny him genius and scout the idea that he was the author of the incomparable plays are apt to overlook. It is certain, even from the vague records of his career, that he was jocular, an actor, and a prominent member of a successful theatrical company. There, is, however, no evidence that he ever played a leading part.

There is only a tradition that he appeared on the stage as the ghost in *Hamlet*, and, perhaps, as Adam in *As You Like It*. Why then was this actor of minor parts an important member of a celebrated company? "But Shakespeare, even if an inferior actor, wrote the plays," say the Stratfordians. "He could not, and did not write them," say opponents. The use of his name on the Quarto and Folio editions of the plays has, however, to be accounted for. Suppose then, that although not the author, he had *something to do with them*. Suppose that, having theatrical experience, he contrived, rightly or wrongly, to get the text of them in MS. or otherwise, and had the wit and stagecraft to adapt them, or some of them, to the taste of the lower class in a public audience. Skill as a producer of plays might make him more valuable to his fellows than excellency as an actor. No student of style can reasonably deny that there is evidence in some plays of two pens—one with a broader nib than the other.

Let me now, as a preliminary, call attention to the following facts: in the year 1593 *Venus and Adonis*, in 1594 *Lucrece*, in 1594 *Titus Andronicus*, and the *First*

Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous houses of York and Lancaster, and in 1597 *Richard the Second*, *Richard the Third*, and *Romeo and Juliet* were all published *without any author's name*. In the next year appeared a quarto entitled "The History of Henrie the Fourth with the battel at Shrewsburie, betwean the King and Lord Henry Percie, surnamed Henrie Hotspur of the North. With the humourous conceits of Sir John Falstaffe. At London, Printed by S. S. for Andrew Wise dwelling in Paule's Churchyard, at the signe of the Angell, 1598." And still *no name* of any author on the title-page. But, in that same year, a Quarto was published with the title printed thus, *viz.* : "A Pleasant Conceited Comedie called 'Loves Labors Lost.' As it was presented before Her Highness this last Christmas. Newly corrected and augmented By W. Shakespere. Imprinted at London by W. W. for Cuthbert Burby, 1598."

This is, I believe, the first appearance of the name W. Shakespere on any edition of a play. Observe the punctuation and Capitals of the title-page. It does not state that the play was *written* by him, but only "corrected and augmented." If so, where can his correction and augmentation be discerned in it? Effective correction is certainly absent, for, as the learned Cambridge Editors of *Love's Labour's Lost* point out in a Note on Act II., Scene i. : "In this and other scenes the characters are so confused in the old copies that they can be determined only by the context, in this play a very unsafe guide." Vol. II., p. 193. Then is augmentation perceptible? I think so. Consider the feeble nonsense of that part of Act III., Scene i., in which Moth brings in Costard and says, "A wonder, Master, here's a Costard broken in a shin," and so on. One can imagine the stage business of the Clown, limping, rubbing his leg and crying out for

a plaister. Then rhyming parley about it for some sixty lines until Armado says: "We will talke no more of this matter, Clown. Till there be more matter in the shin." Whereupon, quite inconsequently, Armado says: "Sirrah Costard I will enfranchise thee," and he replies, "O, marry me to one Frances," etc.—a curious perversion of sound, perhaps not quite so meaningless as may be supposed. There are also other lines given to the Clown in the next Act which bring on him the just remonstrance from Maria, "Come, come, you talk greasily, your lips grow foul." I suggest that much of Costard's "gag" in this play was the "augmentation" of the actor W. Shakespere.

Elsewhere in the play are other prose passages unworthy of the true author. In the next year appeared another Quarto of *Henry the Fourth* with a significantly printed addition to the title-page of the first, for, after the words "With the humorous conceits of Sir John Falstaffe," and a full stop, come the words "Newly corrected by W. Shakespeare." He still does not claim the *authorship*.

The extraordinary contempt of fame shewn by the true playwright in allowing his matchless works to go abroad to the world in garbled and ill-printed versions may account for his tolerance of the so-called augmentation and correction of them. Impunity, some pact, or other consideration may soon have emboldened the actor to change his title-page rôle of augments and corrector to that of author, for in many Quartos afterwards printed, but not in all, the words "Written by W. Shakespeare" appear on title-pages, and of course, the plays which were first printed as a collection in the Folio of 1623 were ascribed by his fellows, the Editors of it, to him.

A better test of authorship than scrutiny of title-pages would be an examination of the style and con-

22 Shakespeare's "Augmentations"

stance of the Plays. There are humourous scenes in them which are indisputably works of genius, there are others so far inferior that they must surely have been added by an "augmenter." Take the standard of fine humour afforded by Falstaff and, by it, test the quality of many low comedy scenes and passages which break the continuity of matchless verse in various plays. Give even the Stratfordian reader a blue pencil and he would surely pick and strike out those scenes without injury to sense or plot. A few of them may be here indicated, although grossness of theme and phrase render effective citation undesirable.

Their peculiarities are either irrelevance, impropriety, sameness of topic, or distortion of the meaning of words by mere misplacement of syllables.

In *Henry IV.* (first part) the Carrier's colloquy forming Scene ii. of Act II. is unnecessary to the plot, coarse in language, and might have been invented by any frequenter of an Inn stable-yard. The Third Act of *Love's Labour's Lost* already mentioned is mainly superfluous prose inserted to eke out the thirty-two lines of genuine verse at the end. Scene i. of Act I. in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* is amplified and the whole Scene v. of Act II. filled by quibbles of speech which are below the average of wit as shewn elsewhere. Pages of rhyming nonsense with rude metre in the *Comedy of Errors*, Act. III. Sc. i. seem certainly to have been imported into it by someone other than the author of that play. Breaking discordantly into the exquisite blank verse of Helena in *All's Well*, Act I. Sc. i., is a prose denunciation of virginity with tiresome iteration of the word, and false far-fetched analogies.

From many good parts of Clowns and Constables and other droll characters in other plays examples might be taken of what might fairly be termed tinkering by an adapter conversant with stage requirements of

his plain speaking time. That such an "augmenter and corrector" should have then been allowed for social, political, or monetary considerations, or even from "high disdain" to play the leading part of author without protest from him is wonderful but not incredible.

It has indeed been demonstrated already in the pages of *BACONIANA*.

R.I.P.

WITH profound regret we have to record the decease of the Earl of Verulam. The Viscount Grimston succeeds to the Earldom. We extend our condolences to Lady Verulam and to others of her family who are left to mourn his loss. Ever ready to help us in the great work of eliciting the facts regarding the mystery of Francis, Baron Verulam, and sympathetically looking towards our efforts in that direction, we feel the loss no less keenly.

THE BACON SOCIETY AT CANONBURY TOWER.

ON 6th November, a meeting of the Society was held at Canonbury Tower with the object of showing the new premises to members and friends. Previously, a Council Meeting had been held and at four o'clock on its conclusion members and their friends began to arrive.

The officers of the Council present were: Sir John Cockburn, K.C.M.G., M.D., President, Miss Alicia Leith, Messrs. H. Crouch-Batchelor and Granville C. Cunningham, Vice-Presidents; Captain W. G. C. Gundry, Chairman of the Council; Mrs. Teresa Dexter, Hon. Secretary; Mrs. E. B. Wood, Hon. Treasurer. Others present included Messrs. E. Quinn, Hon. Librarian; Henry Seymour, Chairman of the Editing Committee; Horace Nickson, Walter Gay, Colonel Ward, C.M.G., Rev. E. Francis Udny, Mrs. Vernon Bayley, Mrs. Kindersley, Miss Turner and Madame Christian. The Canonbury Tower Club was represented by Messrs. Leslie Walker (Vice-Chairman), A. Christian and G. L. Emmerson (General Secretary).

Sir John Cockburn said that they all rejoiced in having acquired a local habitation worthy of the name they bore. They had met for the first time in that historical Tower, which was intimately associated with Francis Bacon, who held a lease of the premises for something like forty years, and they felt they were coming into close touch with the greatest of all Englishmen, whose name they were delighted to honour.

Taking the list of names of men who had shone in the history of this country, there was one name written in letters of gold. (Applause.)

They all knew he was a great poet, the greatest poet of his age or of any other age. He was the greatest orator that England ever produced and they honoured him also as the philosopher of utility. He it was who unlocked the keys of Nature's mysteries. He was the High Priest of Nature and they felt it was a great honour to be the privileged few who were holding aloft that light which would eventually enlighten the world. (Applause.)

Although the members of their society were not great in number, it should not be forgotten that there were a group of Bacon Societies, not only in England, but in the United States, and even in Vienna there was a society. They had a great task before them; for they had many enemies. The vested interests in Stratford were very powerful, and had come down like the host of the Philistines upon those who upheld the claim of Bacon to be the author of the greatest work in the English

Bacon Society at Canonbury Tower 25

tongue. But *Magna est Veritas* and they would win because they were on the right side. It would be the forces of Nature that would win. They had Truth on their side, and that must prevail. First of all they must vindicate the character and name of Bacon because the people of this country would never accept as the head of its literature and its poetry a man whom they had been told falsely was a corrupt judge, a sycophant, and a false friend. Baconians knew, however, that he was not a corrupt judge or a false friend, but enjoyed the friendship of many contemporary writers. He was, too, a loyalist to the core. They felt that they were engaged in a crusade which called forth their energies and their enthusiasm. Let them avoid the quicksands and continue to build on foundations which would endure. In conclusion, Sir John congratulated those to whom the Society owed thanks for securing headquarters at Canonbury Tower. (Applause.)

Miss A. Leith proposed a vote of thanks to the President, and also to Mrs. Teresa Dexter, the Hon. Secretary, for the hard work she had put in in connection with the removal to new headquarters. Mrs. Dexter briefly replied, and asked Mr. Leslie Walker to convey to the Hon. Secretary and Committee of the Canonbury Tower Club thanks for their extreme kindness and courtesy to the Bacon Society; everything had been done to make them happy and comfortable. (Applause.)

Mr. Leslie Walker in reply said they were pleased and honoured in having such a society holding their meetings in the old Tower, and he wished it success.

Mr. Christian added a few words of welcome. During the reception, which was well attended, tea was served and those members and friends who had not until then seen the Tower expressed themselves as delighted with it. The speeches above are taken from the report of the meeting which appeared in *The Daily Gazette*, the local newspaper.

W. G. C. G.

"I am firmly convinced that Shakspeare of Stratford could not have been the author."—*Walt Whitman*.

"Do the combatants intend to go to the bottom of the purely historical question? No more, I think, than did the ancient Greek critics into the Homeric question. They were as proud of Homer as we of Shakespeare, and insisted on believing that the blind 'Homer' of the Hymn to Apollo wrote the other hymns, and the 'Iliad,' and the 'Capture of Troy,' and the 'Margites.' Modern criticism has made a great overturn of the Greek notion. . . . Are the devotees of Shakespeare determined to make him a miracle?"—*Professor Francis W. Newman*.

AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF CANONBURY TOWER.

BY HENRY SEYMOUR.

THE history of the Manor of Canbury, or Canonbury, dates back before the Norman Conquest, and is referred to in Domesday Book. After William I. it was owned by Geoffrey de Mandeville, and subsequently by the Berners family. Ralph de Berners gave it to the Priory of St. Bartholomew at Smithfield about the year 1253. It is enumerated amongst other possessions of the monastery in a grant of Henry III., dated at Winchester in the thirty-seventh year of his reign.

During this period the Manor probably comprised only farm and meadow land. There does not appear any authentic evidence that buildings of any importance existed there earlier than the sixteenth century. Stow refers to Prior Bolton, of St. Bartholomew's, who "builded of new the Manor of Chanonbury at Islington, which belonged to the Canons of this house and is situate in a low ground, somewhat north from the parish church there." Many outstanding features of Bolton's work at Canonbury remain, including his rebus carved on a Tudor doorway—a barrel or tun pierced by a bird-bolt. The most important work of the Canons of St. Bartholomew is the picturesque Tower, the finest specimen of late Tudor building in the North of London. Prior Bolton was succeeded by the Abbot Fuller, of Waltham Abbey, in 1532, who eventually surrendered it to Henry VIII. in 1539.

The King thereafter bestowed the Manor, together with the adjoining Manor of Highbury (or Newington Barrowe) upon Thomas, Lord Cromwell, who had

made himself conspicuous in the suppression of the monasteries. In the following year Cromwell, then created Earl of Essex, was attainted of high treason and heresy and was executed on July 28th, when Canonbury reverted to the Crown.

In the first year of his reign Edward VI. granted it to John Dudley, afterwards Duke of Northumberland, and father of Robert, whom Queen Elizabeth, at a later date, created Earl of Leicester. After the death of Edward, and when his sister Mary ascended the throne, John Dudley was attainted and beheaded on Tower Hill on August 22nd, 1553, when Canonbury once more went back to the Crown. Mary then granted it to Broke, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and his wife, during their lives. In June, 1556, the Queen granted it to Thomas, Lord Wentworth, who held it for a number of years, but was obliged ultimately to mortgage it. Later he sold it to John Spencer, a rich City merchant, who spent large sums in beautifying it. Lewis says that the most important part of the old mansion was apparently enlarged and altered by Spencer, who was knighted and became Lord Mayor of London in 1594-5. His town house was Crosby Hall in Bishopsgate, once the charming residence of Sir Thomas More. Previous to 1599, at which time Sir John Spencer went to reside at Canonbury, the place was rented by various persons, and there is little doubt that Queen Elizabeth paid frequent visits there. The famous mulberry tree, which tradition says was planted by her, still remains in the garden, which reminds us of another tradition that "Shakespeare" planted a mulberry tree at "Stratford."

Nelson says that Canonbury Tower was rented of Sir John Spencer by William Ricthorne, Esquire, who died there in 1582, and that it was for a few years after-

wards in the possession of Sir Arthur Ayte, Public Orator of Oxford University, who married his widow. Sir John Spencer was apparently still in residence in 1605, because the Corporation Charter granted to the Butchers' Company in that year is signed by Thomas Egerton, Baron of Ellesmere, then Lord Chancellor, and dated from Canonbury, where it was said that this nobleman was then on a visit to Sir John Spencer. It is also noteworthy that Lord William Compton, who married Elizabeth, the heiress of Sir John Spencer, was also living or staying there at the same time, as a daughter was born there in that year.

Soon after, however, Canonbury appears to have been let to the Lord Chancellor Egerton. Sir John Spencer died in March, 1609, and was buried at St. Helen's in Bishopsgate.

From Lady-day, 1617, Sir Francis Bacon, then Attorney-General, became lessee, with certain stipulations, from Lord and Lady Compton, for a term of 40 years, "if the said Sir William Compton and Sir F. Bacon should so long live." But it appears that this lease was surrendered by Bacon in 1625, for Lord and Lady Compton (then entitled the Earl and Countess of Northampton) gave a tenancy to Sir Thomas Coventry, Knight, His Majesty's Attorney-General. Nelson also says that Canonbury House was rented by the Lord-keeper Coventry until 1635.

The Tower has been held by the heirs of the said Earl of Northampton ever since, although it has passed through some strange vicissitudes. After the Civil War, the then Earl was compelled to mortgage it in order to clear off the heavy debts incurred in the King's service. It was let to William, Viscount Fielding, Earl of Denbigh, who died there in 1685. Later tenants include the Right Hon. Arthur Onslow, one-time Speaker of the House of Commons, Dr.

Oliver Goldsmith (from 1762 till 1764), Woodfall, the printer of the "Junius" letters, Ephraim Chambers, F.R.S. (the first of the Encyclopædists), and Newberry, the publisher.

George Daniel, the well-known bibliophile, who lived close by, tells us that "Lamb was hand in glove with Goodman Symes," the then tenant, and that "he was never tired of toiling up and down the steep winding stairs and peeping into its sly corners and cupboards as if he expected to discover there some hitherto hidden clue to its mysterious origin," and that he was very fond of watching the sunset from the top of the Tower, with its uninterrupted view across to Harrow-on-the Hill.

In 1770, Mr. John Dawes acquired a lease of the entire mansion for a term of 61 years. He pulled down what buildings were on the south side and built the row of houses which still remains. The range of buildings made by Spencer on the east side of the quadrangle was modernized and cut up into three houses by party walls. The "long gallery" was situated there, and its beautiful ceiling is still preserved on the first floor of the School House and Somerset Lodge. It has an intricate pattern of raised bands forming divers shaped panels and containing curious devices, as ships, vases of flowers, and the heads of Roman Emperors. In some of the panels the date 1599 appears, and in the centre, the Royal arms, first and fourth, three *Fleurs de Lys*, second and third, three lions *passant guardant*, encircled with the motto of the Garter.

In the double gable building abutting from and connecting with the Tower are two beautifully panelled oak rooms which were the work of Sir John Spencer, and which are still in a wonderful state of preservation. That on the first floor, known as the "Spencer Oak

Room," is the larger of the two, but the other on the second floor, known as the "Compton Oak Room," is richer in its "double-oak" panelling and general character. The ceilings of these rooms, however, are surprisingly plain by contrast with the surroundings and other beautiful ceilings elsewhere.

The "Compton Oak Room" is now used by the London Bacon Society, and an adjoining room, said to have been an occasional bedchamber of Queen Elizabeth, accommodates the Society's library of rare books.




In 1907-8 the late Marquis of Northampton carried out the restoration of this historic pile regardless of care and expense. No effort was spared to preserve all that remained of its old features. The panelling of the Spencer and Compton oak rooms was carefully washed, repaired, scraped and oiled. In rebuilding an old chimney in the Compton room, which had undergone decay so as to be dangerous (being connected with the main stack), some curious closets were discovered behind the panelling, and large enough to conceal a man. Owing to a part of the wall giving way these secret cavities were built in solid.

A heavy pistol bullet remains embedded in one of the door frames of the Compton room, and close by, a round hole in the panelling suggests the passage of another. The late Warden, Major Dance, says in a report, that this is reminiscent "of the violent scene enacted there during Queen Elizabeth's reign, when Sir Walter Raleigh was nearly a victim to a plot upon his life."

When digging the foundation for the new Hall in the grounds a curious border to a garden path was found below the surface consisting of the leg bones of *pigs*, bedded with the knuckle-joints upwards. Three cartloads of these bones had to be removed. A

gruesome elegy to Bacon, unless intended to shew that the old monks who once resided within the House were like the innumerable impecunious literary scribes of the Elizabethan period who subsisted entirely on Bacon.* In excavating for other foundations in the west front, an underground passage was found, leading south, which was also cut into when laying a drain near the roadway. This, too, was bricked up for safety.

Over the entrance to the upper room of the Tower staircase, or what may more properly be described as the top landing of the staircase, but which is enclosed by a door, the significant words, "Baconian Room," are painted. Just inside is a curious Latin inscription painted in black Roman letters, near the ceiling, well out of reach. It purports to be a record of the abbreviated names of the Kings and Queens of England from William the Conqueror to Charles I., and reads thus:

Will. CON. Will. RVFVS. HEN STEPHANVS. HENQ.
 SECVNDVS 
 Ri IOHN. HEN TERTIVS ED. TRES. Ri SECVNDVS
 HEN. TRES. ED. BINI : Ri. TERTIVS : SEPTIMVS :
 HENRY 
 OCTAVVS POST HVNC ED. SEXT. REG MAR :
 ELIZABETHA SOROR : SVCCEDIT F — IACOBVS 
 SVBSEQVITVR CHAROLVS QVI LONGO TEMPO
 MORS TVA, MORS CHRISTI, FRAVS MVNDI GLORIA
 COELI
 ET DOLOR INFERNI, SINT MEDITANDA TIBI.

(*Notes.*—The line following the letter F before Jacobus is substituted in place of an apparent ragged erasure which has been cut deeply into the stone wall.)

It will be seen that the genealogy is "historically" accurate except in one particular, to wit, the initial

letter *F*, together with an intervening space, between the names of Elizabeth and James. The amount of space which follows this letter *F* could not well have accommodated more than three or four further letters, taking into account the extent of the cutting into the wall. But a little sober reflection will soon dispel the idea or pretence that any name was ever written there and erased. If erasure had been intended, why was the initial clue-letter left? As the inscription was merely painted, where was any necessity to cut into the wall for the purpose of obliteration, when a coat of paint would far more effectually have accomplished that object? Does it not strike everyone that the whole thing is a theatrical display, nicely stage-managed to set its readers thinking? And the last two indented lines,—do they not suggest a parable and an injunction? How utterly out of place with the genealogy above them!

Now, another curious thing about the inscription is that Nelson, in his *History, Topography and Antiquities of the Parish of St. Mary, Islington*, records a version of it as early as 1811, which is not quite the same as the foregoing, copied by me from the Tower itself a few months ago. It will be useful to reprint Nelson's version:

Will. Con. Will. Rufus. Hen. Stephanus. Henq'. secundus.

Ri. John. Hen. tert'. Ed. terni. Ricq'. secundus.

Hen. tres. Ed. bini. Ri. ternus. Septimus. Henry.

Octavus. post hunc. Edw. sext. Regina Maria.

Elizabetha. soror. succedit Fr. ——. Jacobus.

Subsequitur Charolus; qui longo tempore vivat!

Mors tua, Mors Christi, Fraus Mundi, Gloria Coeli,

Et dolor Inferni, sint meditanda tibi.

(*Note*.—The letters of the two last indented lines are identical with those at the Tower, but of course in ordinary type.)



THE COMPTON OAK ROOM, CANONBURY TOWER, LONDON.

Miss Alicia A. Leith first called attention to the importance of this inscription, as constituting independent corroboration,—on the assumption, of course, that the *conspicuous* letter *F* stood for *Francis*,—of the alleged cypher disclosure just previously made by the late Dr. Orville Owen that Francis Bacon was merely a foster-child of Sir Nicholas Bacon and in reality the eldest of two sons of Queen Elizabeth by a lawful though secret marriage with the Earl of Leicester in the autumn of 1559. The late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence at once took a great interest in the matter and had authentic photographs made at the Tower, by permission of the custodians. Mr. W. H. Mallock, the well-known author, drew public attention to the extraordinary character of the inscription in the *Pall Mall Magazine* for January, 1903, and boldly suggested that the said letter *F* could only mean *Francis*, in the light of numerous other outstanding circumstantial evidences.* A heated controversy arose, naturally. Such a revelation was against all “established” opinions. Even Mr. G. B. Rosher, a “cautious” Baconian, fearful of compromising the Bacon cause by such wild-cat stories, essayed to refute the interpretation of Mr. Mallock by the statement in *BACONIANA* for April, 1903, that he had personally inspected the said inscription at the Tower and was quite satisfied that the initial letter under review was not an *F* at all, but an *E*, suggesting, at the same time, that the “obliterated” word was probably *Eamq.*, which would make sense without any particular significance. But there are two serious objections to Mr. Rosher’s point of view; one, that when he “inspected” the inscription, it was nearly illegible with age and dirt; the other, that in setting

* In 1571, a statute was passed making it penal to speak of any other Successor to the Crown than the issue of the reigning Queen!

out the text of the inscription in BACONIANA he did not quite correctly follow either that at the Tower or that given by Nelson, which convicts him of careless observation. But since Mr. Rosher "inspected" the inscription in 1903, the late Marquis of Northampton had it carefully cleaned and merely varnished for future protection, and there is no longer any doubt about the letter being an *F*.

As will have been seen, Nelson printed it more than a century ago, not only as *F*, but with an additional letter *R* following, which is doubly suggestive. This is followed, further, by a simple "dash," or properly speaking, the Latin sign for *minus*. It is very noteworthy that Nelson made no mention of any erasure, or cutting away into the wall, which is remarkable, because such a peculiarity could not well have escaped the eye of the historian, nor would he have been likely to omit comment on it. On the other hand, there is evidence of an earlier restoration of the Tower about the year 1820. At that time, this inscription, dating from the time of Charles I., was doubtless somewhat decayed and dirty, and it is but reasonable to suppose that it was then cleaned or touched up, possibly repainted and inaccurately re-traced by an ignorant or careless workman. I might tell a funny story of what *nearly* happened to the inscription in the last renovation, but let that pass. From the foregoing considerations I am led to the strong opinion that the Nelson version of the inscription is the more correct one, and that it probably so appeared originally at the Tower itself. Yet we can never be too sure of anything concerning Bacon. There are so many obvious instances of his "originals" being duplicated differently for double purposes.

We have thus apparently reached a hiatus in our quest. The application of ordinary common-sense fails

to elucidate the "missing word." Let us try the uncommon sense of inductive cryptography.

Firstly, Nelson adds a period after the letters *Fr*, indicating an *abbreviation* of *Francis*. Next follows the sign of *minus*, which ordinarily represents an omission and not necessarily an erasure. If we count the numerical equivalents of the letters in the word *minus* by Bacon's Reverse Cabala, they total 53! Thus, this simple sign spells "Bacon" to the initiated.

This sign of *minus* may also mean a connecting-link between Francis and James of which there is a key in *Hamlet*.

If we study the letters in *Jacobus*, they seem to suggest an anagram. And the simple transposition of two letters, *B* and *I* (these, again, being a Bacon seal: *vide* verses "To the Reader" in the First Folio of "Shakespeare"), converts *Jacobus* into *Baco, Jus.*, which is Latin for "Bacon by Right!" The numerical equivalents of *Francis* and *Jacobus* also both total 67—the seal well known.

There is also an anagrammatic acrostic of the word *Anagram* in the two indented lines of verse at the foot of the genealogy, to be read backwardly, or left-handedly, commencing with the final *a* in *Meditanda*, and concluding on the first letter *M* in *Mors Tua*, as though to define the extent of the covering text of a more important anagrammatic disclosure. Thus, from

MORS TVA, MORS CHRISTI, FRAYS MVNDI GLORIA
COELI,

ET DOLOR INFERNI SINT MEDITANDA TIBI,
we may, by a transposition of the letters, get the following:

M. FR. BACONVS IN IVST ROIALL RIGHT. MADE
TO SVRRENDER IT FOR IAMES O' SCOTLAND. MIND
IT. III.

(*Note*.—The first letter of the anagram is doubtless for *Magister*, and the word *Mind* is old English for *Remember*. The three final *I*'s constitute Bacon's own signature in the Kay cypher, suggested by the letters *l* (lower case form) in *Gloria*, *Cosli*, and *dolor*, mixed with the other letters of the words, which are capitals, in the Tower version. By adding the seven letters in *Baconus* to the other letters of the Nelson inscription, they total 287 !)

We here have a striking corroboration of Dr. Orville Owen's deciphered lines of Bacon's, referring to King James :

"This forgetful man upon whose head I set the Crown,
And for whose sake I wore
The detested blot of murderous subornation."

If we may accept this even tentatively, then everything becomes intelligible ; for if Bacon was next in the succession after Elizabeth, then he was the only man alive who had the right and power to make James King, involving his own abdication. And if we accept it or reject it, we cannot escape the inevitable conclusion that it is only on the assumption that Francis Bacon was of Royal birth that the Canonbury Inscription has any meaning or coherence.

WHO'S WHO ?

"ROBERT CECILL. He was first created at the Tower of London the 13th May, 1603, Barron Cecill of Essendon in Rutlandshire and at Whitehall ye 20th August, 1604, created Viscount Cranborne in Dorsetshire and at Greenwich, 4th May, 1605, he was created Earl of Salisbury. He was Master of ye Court of Wards, Chancellor of ye University of Cambridge, Lord Treasurer of England, Knight of ye Garter. He died at Marlborough one Sunday, 24th May, 1612."—*Harleian MSS.*, 1174, folio 133.

SHAKESPEARE-BACON'S HAPPY YOUTHFUL LIFE.

BY S. A. E. HICKSON, BRIG.-GEN., C.B., D.S.O.

NEXT year will be the tercentenary of the year in which he, whom we believe to have been the true Shakespeare, suddenly vanished and disappeared from before the eyes of men, sorrowing and sad, yet not embittered. So great was his faith in, and love of, humanity as a whole and God, that he believed always, nay knew, that "spite of cormorant devouring Time," his noble efforts and ceaseless industry for the benefit and relief of the estate and society of man would someday make him "heir of all eternity." May I then with all humility suggest to those who think "the hour's now come"* for convincing mankind, that Shakespeare, the great poet and melodious writer of works of imagination based on experience (*experientia literata*), was one with Bacon, the great Master of the Philosophy of Reason, founded also on experience, according to the inductive principle (*Novum Organum*), that the wisest course may be to put away too much talk about cipher, which the public cannot follow, and about parallels between the writings of Shakespeare and Bacon, which are already well-established and admitted. Gervinus long ago showed that what Bacon writes in prose, Shakespeare puts into verse; and it is not reasonable to expect the ordinary reader to accept the cipher story, until it has been shown to be, in every essential detail, consistent with recognised history and biography. There is no getting away from the fact that the minds of Shakespeare and Bacon

* *Tempest*, Act I., Scene 2.

38 Shakespeare-Bacon's Happy Life

worked on parallel lines. Even what such men as Macaulay, Mr. Spedding, and Mr. J. M. Robertson—to whom all Baconians are so much indebted in spite of himself—say incidentally of Bacon's mind, is equally applicable to Shakespeare. "The poetical faculty was powerful in Bacon's mind, but not, like his wit, so powerful as occasionally to usurp the place of his reason, and to tyrannize over the whole man," says Macaulay (and what more true of Laneham and Euphues?).

"He could conceive like a poet and execute like a clerk of works," says Spedding.

"Bacon was a poet," cries Shelley with ecstasy, and here it is that prophetic Mr. J. M. Robertson joins the choir of these great authorities to swell their harmonious symphony. For nothing could apply more to Shakespeare than what he says of Bacon, that, "to Bacon belonged *in the highest degree* two faculties—that of utterance or statement, and that of *insight into human* character." If Bacon possessed these qualities in the highest degree, what about Shakespeare? Ben Jonson likewise praises both alike. The one clearly had the same gifts as the other; in the same degree, the same power.

Moreover, similar gifts and powers imply similar native genius, nurture and environment, which at once puts Gul. Shaksper of Stratford out of court. Proof to the contrary lacking, this rustic was illiterate, and may be safely set aside as the "Great Gull" or decoy put up by the slim fox, who, during life, bore the name of Francis Bacon,—to draw the general public away from the true scent.

Let it be agreed then that it must be to the historic, not cipher life, to the known character and mind of Bacon that we must mainly turn to put the public on the scent of the true Shakespeare. Materials are now

by no means wanting to enable all who wish to put together a remarkably vivid picture of the gay and garrulous, excessively witty and exuberant, yet purposeful and profoundly wise, universally apprehensive and melodiously musical, gentle, observant, alert, and "all there" young man that Shakespeare in those happy early days of his life must have been. Here Macaulay again helps, saying: "It is certain that at only twelve he (Bacon) busied himself with speculations on the art of Legerdemain, and studied the art of deciphering, with great interest." So that we are not surprised to find him hiding himself behind *motleys* at a very early age, and delighting in the tricks of Reynard—a conjuror, mystical; a mystery.

What then are the data available for tracing him? for it is often said: "The style of Shakespeare is so different from that of Bacon." Of course it is. He tells us expressly, that: "Verse is only a kind of style and form of elocution, and has nothing to do with the matter." The same matter may be written in verse or prose. He tells us that verse and prose are themselves differences of style. Shakespeare and Bacon are, in short, simply different styles of the same man. The matter is the same human character and thought. For this man was out for legerdemain, for concealment, dissimulation. Like a conjuror he actually tells men his method. Yet they do not see it. Small wonder that he calls them dull "and so infelicitous that when things are put before their very feet, they do not see them, unless admonished, but pass right on." It is then not by his style that we must seek him. He studied every form of language and style that he could find for twenty years before he appeared as Shakespeare. He could write in *any* style. But he could *not* write about *any* matter. He could not, would not, alter the bent of his mind, which was for the

40 Shakespeare-Bacon's Happy Life

reform of man's ways of thinking and acting, to direct it towards the right use of experience, reason, the imagination, invention—always we come back to the *novum organum* or scientific induction, and *experientia literata* or art based on experience as we see it in the great plays, always the same mind and matter, colour, design, and strength.

Mr. Granville Cuninghame, in his invaluable book, *Bacon's Secret Disclosed*, has given many valuable hints as to the nature of the clues by which this noble game is to be tracked. We have also the *Mente Videbor*—"I shall be seen (and known) by my mind," of the *Minerva Britanna*, or British Spear-shaker*, and we have Archbishop Tenison's remarks in 1679, regarding this peculiar design, strength and way of colouring of Bacon being found even on pieces, *which do not bear his name*. And though in these we may see plainly what he means, the *Argenis* tells us that "he shall err as well that will have it all to be a true relation of things really done, as he that takes it to be wholly feigned."—"To disguise them I will have many inventions, which cannot possibly agree to those I intend to point out."† It is all legerdemain, partly true, partly feigned, as Puttenham says. The true bits have to be extracted and put together.

Thus, if we take *L'Histoire Naturelle*, Rawley's *Life of Bacon* and Nichols' *Progresses* singly, each seems but a bare skeleton, showing nothing of the complete and perfect man. But treat one as the bone, another as the flesh, and another as the skin, of him we seek; fit them all together,—as you will find they do fit in a wonderful way—and you will see before you a wonderful young man, whose garrulous spirit, love

* See *Shepherd's Calendar*, Gloss, for October, and Barclay's *Argenis*.

† *Bacon's Secret Disclosed*, G. C. Cuninghame, p. 142.

of wit without end and mirth without measure yet earnest purpose is most beautifully and perfectly drawn in the great Progress of Queen Elizabeth in 1575; in *The Princely Pleasures of Kenilworth*; *Laneham's Letter*; the *Entertainment of the Queen's Majesty at Woodstock*, all of the same year; the *Steel Glass* and terrible *Complaint of Philomele* of 1576, and the *Euphues* and *Shepherd's Calendar* of 1579.

From *L'Histoire Naturelle* we learn of the happy beginning of Shakespeare-Bacon's life, which these works portray; of the careful education which he received (the three great translators, Geo. Gascoigne, Thos. North (Plutarch's *Lives*), and Arthur Golding (Ovid), all belonged to the same literary Court circle); of the virtues of his ancestors; the splendour of his race: how, seeing himself "destined one day to hold in his hands the helm of the Kingdom," he (like Euphues), instead of looking only at the people and the different fashions, observed judiciously the *laws and customs* of the countries through which he passed. From Nichols and Barclay's *Argenis* we learn and gather how this young man (thus described as of Royal ancestry) lived at Gorhambury as the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, who at a hint from the Queen added a wing to his house for the Queen's sole accommodation. Nichols takes the greatest pains to show that the Queen stayed there, year after year, from 1572 to 1578. He even traces her there by documents signed under the great seal at Gorhambury. Rawley tells us how much she loved to confer with the young *prodigy*. The Acts of the Privy Council show further that the Council stayed a whole week at Hatfield in 1575 on the way to Kenilworth, the Queen doubtless staying in the rooms provided for her by Sir Nicholas Bacon at Gorhambury, six miles away. Can it be doubted that young Francis Bacon, the

future Shakespeare, joined the royal train, was the "sweet changeling" over whom the Queen and Earl of Leicester (Oberon) quarrelled at Kenilworth, and was also the spritely, witty, facetious and yet wise, author of Laneham's letter published the day after the Queen left Worcester (Aug. 20, 1575); and of "The Tale and Play of the Hermit," presented the following September at Woodstock, in which the Earl of Leicester, who, with Cupid all armed, had so assiduously courted the Queen at Kenilworth, was told that he must give her up "for country's good" ?*

Thus did the venturesome Earl who, as Contarenius in the Play of *The Hermit*, is described as "of mean descent but of value very great," get his dismissal. The Fairy Queen had no intention of publicly marrying, especially a man of mean descent. Nor had she any idea of sharing her power with anyone, even him.

Nichols, in a note, says that the person in Laneham's letter who was to have played the Minstrel of Islington, is shown in the Duchess of Portland's copy as distinctly XIV., that is fourteen. This was Francis Bacon's very age in 1575, and few knew more about Islington than he. He introduced it also into the *Masque of Purpool*, produced at Gray's Inn. And so on. Space forbids more here, but the reader can follow it up for himself.

"The first time I heard Bacon mentioned as the possible author of the Plays and Poems, the idea lit up in my brain, and I felt certain that it could not have been the mummer. . . . The moment it was suggested that Bacon had written them, I felt as many must have felt when they heard for the first time that the earth goes round the sun. Things began to get concentric again; hitherto they had all been eccentric."—George Moore.

* See *Entertainment of the Queen's Majesty at Woodstock, 1585*.

"NOTIONS ARE THE SOUL OF WORDS."

—FRANCIS BACON. [*Novum Organum.*]

BY ALICIA AMY LEITH.

IN the Notions that lie behind the words of Shakespeare we recognise the soul of Francis Bacon.

Staring us in the face on every page, in every Act and Scene, are lessons learnt from personal experience of life ; knowledge not only obtained from books, but from experience personal, wide and varied. Francis Bacon, from out his wide experience of life, has presented to us the very same knowledge in his prose works.

Suppose we look closely at the words of Monsieur " Jacques," on Travel, in *As You Like It*, with Bacon's *Essay of Travel* beside us, and look also at what other plays have to say about Travel.

Jacques : The sundry contemplation of my Travels, by often rumination, wraps me in a most humourous sadness.

Rosalind : A Traveller ! By my faith, you have great reason to be sad.

Jacques : Yes, I have gained my experience.

Bacon : Travel in the younger sort is a part of education, in the elder, a part of experience.

And in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* we find Bacon's notion again behind the words. In Act I., Scene 1 :

Valentine : My loving Proteus, home keeping youths have ever homely wits. I would rather entreat thy company to see the wonders of the world abroad,
Than living dully sluggardised at home
Wear out thy youth with shapeless idleness.

In Act I., Scene 3 :

Antonio : Tell me, Panthino, what talk was that, wherewith my brother held you in the cloister ?

44 "Notions are the Soul of Words"

Panthino : 'Twas of his nephew Proteus, your son.

Antonio : Why, what of him?

Panthino : He wondered, that your Lordship
Would suffer him to spend his youth at home,

* * * * *

And did request me to importune you
To let him spend his time no more at home,
Which would be great impeachment to his age
In having known no travel in his youth.

Mark that Proteus, old, would lack experience, from lacking travel in his youth; a notion which Bacon presents in his *Essay of Travel* in its *very first line*.

Rosalind's words to Jacques in *As You Like It* are good wit, and Bacon explains them in his *Essay of Travel*.

Rosalind : Monsieur Traveller, look you lisp, and wear strange suits, and disable all the benefits of your own country, or I will scarce think you have swam in a Gondola.

Bacon : When a traveller returneth home, let his travel appear rather in his discourse than in his apparel or gesture. And let it appear that he doth not change his country's manners for those of foreign parts, but only prick in some flowers of that he hath learned abroad in the customs of his own country.

The Notions behind Rosalind's words are exactly the Notions of Bacon. Jacques in many ways reminds us of Francis Bacon. He is called, in the Play, *Monsieur Traveller*. So it was the land of France he most affected, and there young Bacon lived for two or three years on leaving college. It was there, later in life, he asked Elizabeth to send him on political affairs. He journeyed to Spain and Italy, his earliest Biography, published in France, tells us; so the allusion to the Gondola by Rosalind is quite *en règle*.

Act IV., Scene 1, in the *Merchant of Venice* is laid in the smaller Council Chamber of the Doge's Palace, described in the Play as the "Duke's Court of Justice."

Amongst the things particularly mentioned “to be seen and observed abroad” in the *Essay of Travel*, are “The Courts of Justice.” He ever put in practice himself what he prescribed for others, and his interest, of course, would naturally include Law Courts wherever he might find himself. So the Ducal Court of Justice in Venice was scrutinised and memorised by him for future use.

His own country—“ever dear” to him—was certainly the gainer for his travels. That Jacques’ notions agree with Bacon’s as to what a Traveller should be and do, is plain. “Observations” is a favourite thought and word with both. Jacques finds the brain of Touchstone, the wise Fool, “crammed with observations,” which he is lucky enough to “vent” in discourse. Jacques envies him that privilege, and craves the same freedom and liberty to speak his mind for the profit of Mankind, or, as he says: “*For the cure of an infected world.*”

Bacon, in his *Essay*, lays great stress on *Observation* and its use. “Young men must not go hooded,” nor “look abroad little in the countries they visit.” They must not look for their information to books or maps alone. They must “see and know.” They must “suck experience,” “personally gather much,” all for “*much profit.*” Profit for others besides themselves. “It is a poor centre of a man’s actions—himself,” says Bacon in *Essay of Wisdom for a Man’s Self*. “All things that have affinity with the heavens move on the centre of another, which they benefit.” So as altruism is Bacon’s Notion, we are not surprised to find Jacques the Traveller demanding leave to cure evil which threatens to engulf the whole world . . . to cure it too with the results of his own sad experiences gained by travel.

Bacon in his *Essay*, insists on the fact that “so

46 "Notions are the Soul of Words"

much is to be observed." "Observations," he says, "are fitted to be registered in Note Books or Diaries for future use." Knowing his predilection for Dramatic Representation, we are not surprised to find him specially mentioning among things to be seen and observed in travel, "Masks and Comedies, such whereunto the better sort of persons do resort." "Such shows," he says, "are *not to be neglected*."

Fine elaborate scene painting already obtained in Paris when young Bacon was there. Some of the best artists from Italy were used by the Queen Mother, Catherine, for the purpose. The acting, by both women and men, on the Italian and French stage, already at that time, was infinitely better than that of the "rude mechanicals" of Britain, who, with their unnatural mouthing and strutting, so distressed the author of *Hamlet*.

The Shake-Speare Stage and Theatre was not yet in existence; it was of "exotic growth," as Ordish, the author and historian of "*Old English Theatres*," tells us. And so, without doubt, Art-loving Bacon pricked many dramatic flowers of foreign growth into the customs of his own country when he returned. Jacques cries out for a motley suit, a stage from which to preach to and teach his fellow Men. Jacques looks to the stage—as the Mountebank of that day looked to his cart—to help him to effect his cures. Cures of what? The Duke in the Play puts it in two words,—he says Jacques wishes to "chide sin."

In this, Jacques ranges himself on the side of "Many wise men and great Philosophers," who, Bacon tells us, looked on the Stage as a means of "improving men in virtue." The stage in England before Shake-Speare's day was not doing that work. And Bacon finds it faulty. It was satirical and biting, neither artistic nor natural, lacking in Art and Science. This is what he

means—according to Johnson’s Dictionary—when he says the stage of his time was quite lacking in *discipline*.

Jacques wishes to cure an infected world, and what he means by that we want to find out
What is his Notion?

Francis Bacon, in his *Prose Work*, called the world “insane.” He found it wonderfully needing cure. From a youth at College he set himself to the cure of it, a heavy burden for such slight shoulders, and became the Reformer, the Teacher of Virtue by means of the *Mirror, the Stage*.

Bacon desired to cure the world of its insanity. If we want to understand Shake-Speare, we shall really have to go to Bacon, for he makes all the dark speeches clear, and *his* Notions ever underlie them. Jacques speaks vaguely of an “infected world,” without explaining in what its infection consists. Bacon, in his *Essay of Envy*, says: “Envy being in the Latin word, *Invidia*, goeth in the modern languages by the name of discontentment. It is a disease like to infection, for as infection spreadeth upon that which is sound, and tainteth it, so, when envy is gotten into a State, it traduceth even the best actions thereof and turneth them into an ill odour. . . . Of all other affections it is the most importune and continual. It is also the vilest and the most depraved, for which it is the proper attribute of the devil, who is called the envious man that soweth tares amongst the wheat by night, as it always cometh to pass that envy worketh subtilly and in the dark, and to the prejudice of good things, such as the wheat.”

Bacon had reason, more than most men, to know about this “night work,” as he called it. Envy and jealousy was the vice that brought him his disgrace and fall. Envy, malice and hatred did their foul work on him. He says, “A man that hath no virtue in

48 "Notions are the Soul of words"

himself, ever envieth virtue in others." In his *Essay of Discourse* he warns that *speech of touch* towards others must be sparingly used, for discourse ought to be without coming home to any man." Jacques means to take examples from life.

Jacques : I must have liberty to blow on whom I please . . .
he of the basest function . . . let me see
wherein my tongue hath wronged him . . . if
he be free, why then my taxing like a wild goose
flies unclaimed of any man.

To be a Reformer, a Teacher, in this insane world—which, alas, has yet need of cure, though it is three hundred years more advanced, we hope, than when Francis trod it—means to be a Martyr.

Without question, Francis Bacon is Francis S. Alban, the Martyr.

It is ever, as he tells us, the man of no virtue that envies virtue in others. So he was a man of worldly wisdom enough to hide his identity when he blew upon, or, as we say, *showed up* the people and errors of his day. In his person of Dramatist he wore a mask—several masks—and so his goose-quill flew and did its perfect work without dragging his name, as the author, through the mire. Enough mire was thrown at him without that. Bacon the Idealist, Bacon the Reformer, are titles that best describe him. To convince the world of sin was his *Life's Work*.

Melancholy Jacques calls the world a Stage; Francis Bacon calls the world God's Theatre.

Jacques calls the men and women on it Players; Bacon calls them Men of Action or Motion.

Hamlet goes deeper than Jacques. He ponders on the thought "To be or Not to be," and what ills may come "when we have shuffled off this mortal coil."

In his *Essay of Death* Bacon says: "Death exempts

not a man from Being, and “after the soul hath shaken off the flesh, it will show what finger hath enforced her.”

Hamlet ponders on troubled dreams brought about by conscience possibly breaking otherwise sweet rest.

Bacon, in his *Essay of Great Place*, says, “Conscience is the accompaniment of Man’s Sabbath rest; if a Man can be Partaker of God’s Theatre, he shall be partaker of God’s rest,” and *vice versâ*.

According to Bacon, we, acting in God’s Theatre, may be good actors or bad ones. We may obey the Prime Mover of our actions, and so win our rest; or by disobeying His enforcing Finger, find ourselves no sharers in His Sabbath. Every one of the Plays of Shake-Speare enshrines Reforming Notions; the *same* Reforming Notions which are in Francis Bacon’s prose works; Notions that deal with just the same subjects and questions.

“To do good is the lawful end of aspiring,” Bacon tells us. To produce fruit without acknowledging the production is part of the high motives of men of Bacon’s School. It was a wise as well as an humble act to hide his identity as Playwright, for to certain men of vicious hate and malignity, he was already a target. The sun beats down hottest, he tells us, on the prominent places of earth; and he was already a marked man, because of his power and influence in the world, even from his youth.

It is not in one Part, and in one Shake-Speare Play only, but in *all*, that he, the great Idealist, the Great Reformer, bids us “Stand, and then look about us, and discover the right and straight way, and so to walk in it.” These words are from our Poet-Philosopher’s *Essay of Innovation*.

DUOLOGUE BETWEEN ENQUIRER AND LORD ST. ALBAN.

ENQUIRER. In *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act I., Egeus complains that Lysander has: "bewitched the bosom of his child, with cunning he has filched his daughter's heart. Has stolen the impression of her fantasie with bracelets of his hair, rings, gauds."

What have you to tell us about such things?

ST. ALBAN. It is good to consider upon what things imagination hath most force . . . the spirits of men, and procuring of love. Certainly it is agreeable to reason that there are at least some light effluxions from spirit to spirit . . . when men are in presence one with another. We see the opinion of Fascination is ancient for effects of procuring love. It is received that it helpeth to continue love if one wear a ring, or a bracelet of the hair of the party beloved.

ENQUIRER. In Act II., Scene ii., Helen says: "Happy is Hermia wheresoe'er she lies, for she hath blessed and attractive eyes." Lysander says to Helen: "Reason becomes the marshal to my will, and leads me to your eyes, where I o'er-look Love's stories, written in Love's richest book."

Do you attach much importance to eyes?

ST. ALBAN. Fascination is ever by the eye. If there be any infection from spirit to spirit, there is no doubt but that it worketh . . . most forcibly by the eye. The aspects which procure love are sudden glances, and dartings of the eye.

ENQUIRER. In Act V., Scene i., Hippolyta finds something "strange and admirable" in the Story of the Night. Theseus objects: "More strange than true," and "I never may believe these fairy toys." Do you approve?

ST. ALBAN. I reprehend the easy passing over the Causes of things . . . for this hath arrested and laid asleep all true enquiry.

ENQUIRER. In Act III., Scene ii., Puck says: "I go, I go, swifter than arrow from the Tartar's Bow." Can you tell us why Tartar's Bow?

ST. ALBAN. The Turkish Bow giveth a very forcible shoot . . . insomuch that it hath been known that the arrow hath pierced a steel target, or a piece of brass two inches thick; but that which is more strange, the arrow if it be headed with wood, hath been known to pierce through a piece of wood eight inches thick . . . a violent motion—these instances of arrows.

ENQUIRER. Oberon says he knows a bank whereon the Wild Thyme blows, there sleeps Titania, lulled in these flowers with dances and delights. Can you explain why Wild Thyme lulls her in delight?

ST. ALBAN. The breath of flowers is far sweeter in the air where it comes and goes like the warbling of music, than in the hand. Therefore nothing is more fit for that delight than to know what are the flowers that do best perfume the air. Those that perfume the air most delightfully . . . being trodden upon and crushed are three . . . Burnet, Wild Thyme, and Water-mint. Therefore you must have whole alleys when you walk and tread.

ENQUIRER. And dance? Thank you. You and Oberon agree. Oberon also mentions oxlips and nodding violets on the bank. Do you like these flowers too?

ST. ALBAN. I like little heaps such as are in wild heaths, to be set with Wild Thyme, and some with violets, some with cowslips and the like flowers, withal sweet and sightly.

ENQUIRER. Why *nodding* violets, Lord St. Alban?

ST. ALBAN. When bodies are moved or stirred, they smell more. The daintiest smell are violets, roses and woodbine.

ENQUIRER. Ah! Woodbine! Titania's couch is quite over-canopied with woodbine; (honeysuckle, of course) and sweet musk-rose, and eglantine; (sweet-brier, of course). What say you to that?

ST. ALBAN. I would have thickets made only of sweet-brier, and honeysuckle. The sweetest smell in the air is the violet . . . next to that is the musk-rose.

ENQUIRER. Shake-Speare and you are one indeed!

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

(See *Nat. Hist. Cent. and Essay of Gardens.*)

THE MANUSCRIPT OF SAINT HELENA

The Autobiography of Napoleon Bonaparte

NOW OFFERED FOR THE FIRST TIME TO ENGLISH READERS

This remarkable Manuscript was sent from St. Helena
"in a manner unknown" in 1817

Mentioned by Napoleon in his will 1821

Publication in French prevented in France 1817

Publication in English prevented in England 1817

Manuscript rediscovered in 1923 and translated into
English by Willard Parker, President of the Bacon
Society of America

Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York,
London & Paris

PRICE, TWO DOLLARS

Sent postpaid on receipt of price by

WILLARD PARKER, Conshohocken, Pa., U.S.A.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY AND SHAKESPEARE.

BY R. L. EAGLE.

PROFESSOR F. S. BOAS does not bring Shakspeare of Stratford any nearer to the authorship of the Shakespeare plays than he was before the publication of his book *Shakespeare and the Universities* (Shakespeare Head Press, 1923). Nor can it honestly be said that the book makes any very important advance in knowledge though the research among the manuscripts and archives at Oxford must have been laborious.

He says that Shakespeare knew Oxford much better than Cambridge and that "he was probably thinking of College performances there in the Lord Chamberlain's reminiscences of how he enacted Julius Cæsar." (*Hamlet* III.-2). But there is no evidence produced to show that the *author* Shakespeare knew Oxford better than Cambridge. Professor Boas is, as all professional men-of-letters must be, a respectable Stratfordian. The name of Francis Bacon does not occur once in his book. Why, then, does he make his Shakespeare better acquainted with Oxford than with Cambridge? Because to keep the Stratford delusion going it has got to be done. Was not Bacon a Cambridge man?

On page 42 we are told how Oxford "was the chief halting-place between his birthplace and the Capital," so what more natural than he should know Oxford better than Cambridge even if the works of Shakespeare obstinately point in the opposite direction, as they unquestionably do, as Professor Boas's book really shows.

He points out that in *Timon of Athens* (IV.-3), the

dramatist shows familiarity with certain distinctively Cambridge terms. Timon exclaims :

Hadst thou like us, from our first swath *proceeded*
The sweet *degrees* that this brief world affords
Thy nature did *commence* in sufferance, time
Hath made thee hard in't.

Boas makes the following commentary upon this passage :

"Here the misanthropist talks as if he had graduated on the banks of the Cam. From the earliest days to times comparatively recent a candidate for a degree at Cambridge was required to maintain a syllogistical dispute in the schools, which disputation was called 'The Act.' If he was successful and admitted to the full privileges of a graduate, he was said to 'commence' in Arts or a Faculty, and the ceremony at which he was admitted was, and is, called at Cambridge 'the Commencement.' If the candidate went to a higher degree he was said to *proceed*.

"And the terms come as aptly to the lips of the hedonist as of the misanthropist, for in Falstaff's praise of sack he declares that '*Learning* is a mere hoard of gold till sack *commences* it and sets it in *act* and use.' (2 *Henry IV.*, iv.-3)* And even more peculiarly reminiscent of Cambridge is Lear's outburst to Regan :

'Tis not in thee to scant my sizes.

"'Size,' as defined by Minsheu, *Guide into Tonges* (1617), 'is a portion of bread and drink ; it is a farthing which schollers in Cambridge have at the buttery.' To be 'scanted' of 'sizes' was a punishment for undergraduates, an indignity that might well stir Lear to a transport of rage."

Nor is this all the evidence of the poet's connection with Cambridge University. In 1595, a book called

* A similar connection between 'commence' and 'act' have been noted in 2 *Henry IV.* (Prologue) and 2 *Henry VI.* (iii.-2).

Polimanteia was published. Its author is given as "W. C." (supposed to be William Covell, a fellow of Queen's College) and in a passage praising the poets and writers of "sweet Cambridge," there is printed in the margin, "All praiseworthy Lucretia, Sweet Shakespeare, Eloquent Gaveston, Wanton Adonis."

In *Titus Andronicus* he correctly uses a colloquial expression of the University:

Knock at his *study* where, they say, he *keeps*.

Edwin Reed in *Francis Bacon our Shakespeare* (1902), on pp. 43-45, gives many arguments in support of the contention that Dr. Caius in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is an ingenious caricature of Dr. John Caius of Cambridge University who died in 1573 and whose name still lives.

How much more interesting Professor Boas could have made his book had he been able to free his mind from the monstrous Stratford delusion. In this way is research hampered, and knowledge suffers in consequence.

STRATFORD "PIOUS FRAUDS."

"About ten years ago Mr. Joseph Skipsey, who for some considerable time had been a highly esteemed custodian of the so-called birthplace [Shakspere's] in Stratford (placed there on the recommendation of Mr. John Morley) suddenly and unexpectedly resigned his position and left town. It appears, however, that he made an explanation of the case in writing which he entrusted to a friend, but with the injunction that nothing should be divulged to the public concerning it until after his death. He died in 1903. In *The Times* newspaper (London), of recent date we now have a full statement of the case in Mr. Skipsey's own words. He resigned in effect because he was disgusted with the innumerable frauds to which he found himself committed there in the discharge of his official duties. As to the relics, he expressly declared that they had become on thorough investigation a 'stench in his nostrils.'"—*The Truth concerning Stratford-on-Avon*, by Edwin Reed.

REPORT OF MEETING.

BY the courtesy of Mr. and Mrs. H. Crouch Batchelor a meeting of the Society was held at 10, Wetherby Terrace, S.W. 5, on December 18th. The Chair was taken by Mr. Crouch Batchelor, who called upon the President to open the proceedings. Col. B. R. Ward, C.M.G., then spoke on the nature of the recent researches for the "Shakespeare Fellowship" into the works of George Gascoigne who heads the list of poets given by Stow in his *Annals or General Chronicle of England*, 1615. This has proved most interesting, establishing the fact that the work published under his name *A Hundred Sundrie Flowers*, contains the work of at least three poets—the Earl of Oxford and Sir Christopher Hatton; and in an admirable preface by Captain B. M. Ward, who is responsible for most of the research—it is shown that *The Poesies of George Gascoigne, Esquire* are a deliberately muddled-up version of *A Hundred Sundrie Flowers*, which volume he has proved to be the work of several authors and not of George Gascoigne alone.

An interesting discussion followed in which Sir George Greenwood, Mr. E. P. Hewett, K.C., Captain Gundry and Mr. Henry Seymour took part. The Chairman-Host then wound up the proceedings in his usual facile and witty manner and a vivacious buzz of conversation over the refreshments provided by our gracious Hostess closed a very successful evening.

THE BACON SOCIETY ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Meeting took place at Canonbury Tower on Thursday, February 5th, 1925. The president occupied the chair. After the Minutes of the last Annual Meeting were read and passed, the President, Council and Officers were duly re-elected. The treasurer's report and balance sheet were eminently satisfactory, inasmuch as a considerable credit balance is in hand, which, with the augmentation of the new year's subscriptions, will total a respectable figure. A goodly number of members was present, and tea was served after the meeting terminated, when a buzz of conversation took place subsequently for some considerable time, during which many controversial differences of opinion were discussed in a real and friendly spirit.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of "BACONIANA."

I have read with much interest the September number of BACONIANA, and wish that I could personally have heard this series of admirable lectures, which show such a large amount of careful research. I do not, however, altogether agree with our President when he states that the double A "figures so frequently in the headlines of Bacon's works." Some years back, perhaps twenty or more, the constant recurrence of the headline of the double A struck me very forcibly, and I noted all the books in which I found it, until I had a list of 74, but only in one instance did I find the name of Bacon as the author, and that was on a copy of *The Remaines of Lord Verulam*, 1648. The headline has been noted by others on some copies of *Bacon's Essayes*. It is, however, found on books which many think were written by Lord Bacon, such as the early quartos of *Shakespeare*, when they were published anonymously, but gradually disappeared as the name of Shakespeare became prominent, and reappeared in the Folio of 1623. The earliest date where I have found the double A headline is on *A Brief Discourse of Doctor Allens*, 1588, and the latest, *The Mirour of State and Eloquence*, 1656. Mr. Smedley, who was also much interested in the subject, made a list about the same time that I did, and we compared notes. His list was longer than mine and differed considerably, which shows how widespread was the use of this device. It was used on the Continent as well as in London. A very interesting article on the subject will be found in BACONIANA of July, 1910, Vol. VIII., No. 31 (Third Series), signed Y. Ledsem.

At the beginning of Act I. in the play of Dr. Faustus, written by George Chapman, Faustus is conversing with his friends about astrology and magic, and how he can study them, when Valdo says:

"Then hast thee to some solitary grove,
And bear wise Bacon's and Albanus' works,
The Hebrew Psalter, and New Testament."

Who Albanus is has puzzled the learned. Is it the key to the double A? Is the double A the sign of some literary and scientific society of which Lord Bacon was the head and whence issued a large portion of that Elizabethan literature which it has been said spoke the same language and had the same moral purpose?

E. J. DURNING-LAWRENCE.

To the Editors of "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRs,—The following extracts from *Debrett* (1920 edition) may be of interest to your readers:—

"Bacon, First Creation (E) 1611, of Redgrave, Suffolk; Second Creation (E) 1627, Mildenhall, Suffolk."

Debrett states that the present holder of the title is the premier Baronet of England and gives the arms of the family as:—"Gules, on a chief argent, two mullets, pierced sable. Crest.—A boar passant ermine. Motto.—*Mediocria Firma*."

The following account of the family is taken from the same source:—

"This family claims descent from Grimbald, who came into England with his kinsman William, Earl de Warenne, at the Norman invasion, and settled at Letheringset, near Holt, Norfolk. His great-grandson, Robert, took the name of Bacon, and from his brother, Sir William, of Monks Bradfield, in Suffolk, descended, in the tenth generation, Sir Nicholas Bacon (Lord Keeper of the Great Seal to Queen Elizabeth) who was father of that great luminary of science, Sir Francis Bacon."

It occurred to me that the above account of the family might be of interest to our French friends and co-workers and that the Norman origin of the Bacon family would serve as another tie between us in our mutual labour.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM DE GARENNE.

Heilly-sur-Ancre,
Somme, France.

27th January, 1925.

MOLAI OR MOLAY EXTRACT FROM "FAMILY NAMES AND THEIR STORY."

By S. BARING GOULD.

"Bacon comes from *Bascoin*, the family name of the Seigneurs of Molai. *Anchets Bascoin* before the conquest made grants of his Lordship of Molai to St. Barbe-en-Ange, and William Bacon, Lord of Molai, in 1082, founded Holy Trinity, Caen; in 1082, Rogier Bacon is mentioned as of Ville-en-Molai, who held as well estates in Wiltshire."

A. A. LEITH.

To the Editors of "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIRs,—Perhaps the following parallelism of sentiment between Shakespeare and Bacon may be considered of sufficient significance for insertion in your columns:—

In *Pericles*, Act 1, Scene 4, we read:—

"And by relating tales of others griefs
See if 'twill teach us to forget our own."

Bacon, writing to King James on 16th July, 1621, referring to his fall, says:—

"‘Utar,’ saith Seneca to his Master, ‘magnis exemplis; nec meae fortunae, sed tuae.’ Demosthenes was banished for bribery of the highest nature, yet was recalled with honour, Marcus Livius was condemned for exaction, yet afterwards made Consul and Censor. Seneca banished for divers corruptions, yet was afterwards restored, and an instrument of that memorable Quinquennium Neronis. Many more." In another letter written sometime in 1622 to the Bishop of Winchester Bacon says:—

"My Lord,—Amongst consolations, it is not the least to represent to a man's self, like examples of calamity in others: For examples give a quicker impression than arguments; and besides, they certify us, that which also the Scripture also tendreth for satisfaction, ‘that no new thing is happened unto us.’ This they do the better, by how much the examples are liker in circumstances to our own case; and more especially, if they fall upon persons, that are greater and worthier than ourselves."

Yours faithfully,
W. G. C. GUNDRY.

Lingfield.
29th January, 1925.

[On account of the exigencies of space in this issue, a few other letters have been crowded out. We might often include short letters, but when they are lengthy, it is sometimes very difficult to fit them in, especially when, perhaps, some of the type is already in print and held over from previous numbers. We have received a communication from Mr. Henry Seymour in response to the invitation extended to readers by "J. R." in the last number, apropos of the recent cypher disclosures by Prof. Margoliouth from the Attic dramas, to try their hands at an anagrammatic rendering of the first three lines of *The Tempest*. Mr. W. M. Grimshaw has noted that the marginal initial letters of these three lines, viz., B, H, G, represent 287 in figures, this number being the well-known Bacon-Shakespeare seal.]

"The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."—*Charles Dickens*.

SHAKESPEARE BORROWS FROM BOIARDO:

A PROPOS of a remark in Dr. Johnson's Preface to Shakespeare that no one had discovered in his works any imitation of the Italian poetry, although the latter was held in high esteem in Shakspeare's day, Mr. Sillard, in the *Westminster Review*, supplied a startling parallel from the Italian author, Matteo Boiardo, who died eighty years before Shakspeare.

TRANSLATION FROM BOIARDO.

He who steals a horn, a horse, or a ring,
And such like things, shows some discernment,
And might be called a little thief.
But he who robs me of my good name,
Or arrogates to himself the labors of others,
May well be called an assassin and a robber,
And merits the greater hatred and punishment,
In so far as the reality exceeds the counterfeit.

SHAKESPEARE (IAGO TO OTHELLO).

Who steals my purse, steals trash ; 'tis something, nothing ;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands ;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed.

"You ask my opinion, in a few words, upon the Bacon-Shakspeare controversy, which has been a study of immense interest to me for nearly twenty years. In examining a problem of such importance to English literature as the authorship of the plays attributed to Shakspeare one can hardly use too great deliberation. I felt this so strongly that it was only after about ten years' reading and reflection that I became a convinced Baconian."—*Hon. William Waldorf Astor.*

SIR THOMAS MORE AGAIN.

REGARDING Mr. Cuming Walters' review, in the *Manchester City News* of 11th October last, as the most illuminating and trenchant we have yet seen, of Sir George Greenwood's recent book on *The Shakspeare Signatures and Sir Thomas More* (London : Cecil Palmer, 5s. net), we have decided to reprint it here :

"It goes without saying that a genuine specimen of Shakespeare's manuscript would be of inestimable value. We should treasure it for the sake of the immortal poet, and we should welcome it as conclusive evidence as to the authorship of the works. If only a single page of a drama could be discovered every doubt would be set at rest, and there would be universal rejoicing. All that we at present possess are six signatures, and unhappily they add to our perplexity instead of resolving it. These six signatures are terrible scrawls, even for the period ; they are incomplete, and they provide us with a variety of spellings which is inexplicable, especially when we consider that two of the variations are found on one document and were written on the same day.

SCRAWLS AND BLOTS.

"Can it be possible, we are forced to inquire, that our greatest poet could not spell his name ? Strange arguments are advanced to account for the anomalies ; extraordinary excuses are offered ; but the puzzle remains. Not only is the spelling, however, a mystery. The script, the very caligraphy, adds to our surprise. In Shakespeare's time the Italian style had been adopted by most men of culture, and the old-fashioned German (or Old English) was abandoned except, perhaps, in

legal documents. Yet Shakespeare wrote his almost illegible and undecipherable name in Old English, and badly at that. Could he have made a copy of his plays in this same hand? If so, we can but pity the actors who had to read the parts and the printers who had to use the manuscript. The Heminge and Condell testimony, however, leads us to believe that there was a 'fair copy' somewhere, and that it was without a blot. Alas! no sign of that fair copy is discoverable, and the unfortunate fact remains that if Shakespeare did not blot his manuscripts he blotted his signatures, for one very ugly and awkward specimen exists.

LIGHT OUT OF DARKNESS.

"However, it seemed that the mists were to be swept away when Sir E. Maunde Thompson made his startling and stupendous revelation a few years ago that he had laid hands upon several pages of the poet's handwriting in a play called 'Sir Thomas More.' This was illumination indeed. Whole pages, written by Shakespeare, verifiable in every detail, beyond all probable possible shadow of doubt! It was enough to make us all stand still and hold our breath, and then to break out in loud Hallelujahs. And yet . . . well, Sir Sidney Lee, among others, most ardent of investigators, failed to get excited, and though Sir Maunde Thompson and a little band of supporters were vehement in their protestations, the world in general seemed to remain deaf, the faithful Shakespeareans were scarcely moved, and as for the wicked Baconians they remained as unregenerate as ever. Those who wished to be converted were converted easily and at once—or at all events they said so; and they boldly declared that nothing could be said by the heretics on the other side.

THE DARKNESS FALLS AGAIN.

"But now Sir George Greenwood appears (he is not a Baconian, only an impartial investigator), with a volume of a hundred pages, in which he examines Sir M. Thompson's contentions in every particular respect, subjects each item to intense and microscopic scrutiny, brings his own indisputable scholarship to bear upon the subject, and tells us, as the result, that not in a single instance is there a scrap of reason or an iota of fact to lead us to credit the discovery as genuine. It is an illusion; indeed, as he presents the case, bit by bit, it is a grotesque monstrosity, a ludicrous phantasy to be laughed at rather than treated seriously. He pricks the bubble, and it explodes ingloriously.

"SORELY STRICKEN."

"Sir George performs his severe task in a very genial spirit, for he is a good-tempered controversialist, and in this respect sets an example to his opponents. Very justly he makes no allegations of offence; he simply regards the whole business as an error, and he proceeds to show how irrational and illogical it is. He takes the lettering by turn and he analyses Sir Maunde Thompson's own statements. He supplies both facts and criticisms. He draws attention to amazing inconsistencies. Thus, dealing with one of Sir Maunde Thompson's explanations (he has a different one, by the way, to suit each circumstance as it arises, and they are usually in conflict with each other), Sir George observes:

"According to Sir E. M. Thompson, Shakspeare was taught to write well and elegantly in his school days, so well and elegantly, indeed, that he acquired the

habit of employing fine, delicate and amenable up-strokes in the case of 'amenable letters.' One would fain ask why he did not employ these in his 'Blackfriars' signatures, or in the 'Wallace' signature? He kept them, it seems, for his third will signature, when he was mortally ill, and when, after giving this unique demonstration of his cultivated caligraphy, he fell back so exhausted that he could accomplish nothing more that could be properly dignified by the name of writing at all!

"The argument appears to be this. If Shakspeare had not been very ill he would not have written so badly as he did. But he did write very badly. Therefore he must have been very ill. But it is quite possible that Shakspeare's handwriting may have been very defective even when he was in good health. Certainly the signatures to the conveyance and mortgage do not negative such a belief. And what evidence is there that Shakspeare really was 'sorely stricken' when he signed his will? The will itself bears witness that the testator was in 'perfect health.' It may be said, of course, that this was true when it was first drafted. But if later on, when Shakspeare was called upon to sign it, he was really sick unto death, surely the false statement, as it would then have been, would have been corrected! But, be this as it may, we know that Shakspeare lived for a month after he had signed his will, for he did not die till April 23rd, and there is really no reason to suppose—at any rate, there is no warrant for assuming as an undoubted fact—that he was so ill on the previous 25th of March that he was unable to write in his usual way.

"Sir George Greenwood's analytical criticisms are so closely interwoven and need to be so carefully followed in every detail, that we could not do justice to them by detached quotations though we have marked numerous passages. We must therefore commend the work as a whole to those interested. We have no doubt as to the effect. There will be no more 'Sir Thomas More'—that has gone the way of all figments."

GEORGE GASCOIGNE.

IN the *Hackney Spectator* of the 12th October, 1923, an article by Mr. Francis Clarke entitled: "An Elizabethan List of Poets" was published. The list in question was taken from the fifth Edition of Stow's *Annals or General Chronicle of England*, published in 1615, and is introduced in the following words:

"Our modern and present excellent Poets which worthily flourish in their own works, and all of them in my own knowledge lived together in this Queen's reign, according to their priorities as near as I could I have orderly set down (*viz.*)

George Gascoigne Esquire
Thomas Churchyard Esquire
Sir Edward Dyer Knight
Edmond Spencer Esquire
Sir Philip Sidney Knight
Sir John Harrington Knight
Sir Thomas Challoner Knight
Sir Frauncis Bacon Knight
Sir John Davie Knight
Master John Lillie gentleman
Maister George Chapman gentleman
W. Warner gentleman
Willi: Shakespeare gentleman
Samuel Daniell Esquire
Michael Draiton Esquire, of the bath
Christopher Merlo gen
Benjamin Jonson gentleman
John Marston Esquire
Abraham Frauncis gen
Maister Frauncis Meers gentle
John Webster gentleman
Thomas Heywood gentleman
Thomas Middleton gentleman
George Withers."

Mr. Clarke pointed out certain peculiarities in this list, and asked the following questions:

"1. Is this the first inclusion of the name of Francis Bacon among the poets?

"2. Why is the Earl of Oxford not included?

"3. Why are not Robert Greene, George Peele and Thomas Watson included?"

He ended his article by suggesting that the whole question should be further investigated, pointing out that the author of the article on George Gascoigne—the first poet on the list—in the *Encyc. Brit.*, Vol. XI., p. 493, stated that his first poems “were first published in 1572 during his absence in Holland, surreptitiously according to his own account, but it seems probable that the ‘editor’ who supplied the running comment was none other than Gascoigne himself.”

The very first name on the list of poets—George Gascoigne—is thus seen to be enveloped in

A VEIL OF MYSTERY

and Mr. Clarke's suggestion of further investigation was taken up by Captain B. M. Ward, who by his researches during the past year has succeeded in dispersing a good deal of the fog that has hitherto enveloped the personality of the first on the list of Elizabethan poets.

In the *Hackney Spectator* of the 27th June last Colonel Douglas reported that good progress had been made in these researches, and that they would be reported in due course in the Shakespeare Fellowship column. Captain Ward has now completed his researches, and has recorded them in the form of a Preface to *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, first published in 1573, and generally considered up to the present time as the earliest work of George Gascoigne, and of George Gascoigne alone.

It is hoped that it may be possible before long to find a publisher for this new edition of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, but in the meantime a short resumé of the Preface may be given for the information of the Fellowship.

The Preface consists of some sixty sheets of type-script, and the general results arrived at may be summarised as follows:

1. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* was published in 1573—not 1572 as hitherto supposed—and it contains the work of at least three poets.

2. The name of George Gascoigne is the only one given in the book, the other contributors signing with Latin mottoes, or “posies” as they were called.

3. The Earl of Oxford and Sir Christopher Hatton were contributors to the collection, the former over the motto “*Meritum petere grave*,” and the latter over the motto: “*Fortunatus infelix*.”

4. The Earl of Oxford was editor of the collection, his motto or “posy,” “*Meritum petere grave*” occurring on the Title-page of the book.

5. The Earl of Oxford published *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* while Sir Christopher Hatton was taking the baths at a foreign “Spaw”—Fontaine-bel-eau—and while Gascoigne was absent in Holland in the service of the Prince of Orange against the Spaniards under the Duke of Alva.

6. In 1574—the year following the publication of the book—

the Earl of Oxford left the Court without the Queen's permission and spent a month in the Low Countries, until recalled by the Queen's orders delivered personally to him by Mr. Lemingfield, a Queen's Messenger.

7. On his return to England he amused himself and his friends by drawing the long bow in connexion with imaginary military exploits performed by him under the Duke of Alva at the Siege of Bommel.

8. In 1575, with the Queen's permission this time, Oxford travelled abroad, visiting France, Germany, and Italy, leaving England in January, 1575, and returning in April, 1576.

9. Taking advantage of Oxford's absence abroad, Gascoigne and Hatton between them took it out of their young friend by obtaining the Queen's acceptance of *The Posies of George Gascoigne Esquire*, published in January, 1576.

10. In this book Gascoigne assumed the authorship of all the poems published in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* in 1573, annexing the "posies" "Meritum petere grave" and "Fortunatus Infelix," as well as the others. At the same time he issued a revised version of a

COMPROMISING TALE

about Hatton which Oxford had published in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* as *The Adventures of Master F. I.* This revision he carried out in such a way that he successfully avoided any possible connection with Master Christopher Hatton, whose position with the Queen as Captain of the Guard was endangered by Oxford's amorous adventures with a certain Dame Eleanor.

11. A poem by George Gascoigne entitled "Dulce Bellum Inexpertis," or "War is delightful to those who have had no experience of it," was included in Gascoigne's book. This was, if possible, a nastier one for Oxford than *The Adventures of Master F. I.* had been for Hatton.

Oxford's feelings on his return to England in April, 1576, can be better imagined than described. Hence "the crisis of 1576."

The foregoing are the chief points that are brought out in Captain Ward's Preface. He has shown *The Posies of George Gascoigne Esquire* to be a deliberately muddled-up version of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, which volume he has proved to be the work of several authors and not of George Gascoigne alone.

He has shown "group-action" at work as early as 1576, and has discovered that Elizabethan literary camouflage probably began at the same date, being caused in the first instance by resentment against one of the group who had carried a practical joke a little too far at the expense of another member of the group three years before.

The successful reconstruction of the jig-saw puzzle of *The Posies of George Gascoigne Esquire* is a good omen to the Fellowship for further success in clearing up the mysteries of late Elizabethan literature.—*Hackney Spectator*, December 5th, 1924.

BOOK NOTICES.

De Inscriptie van het Monument van William Shakespeare te Stratford-on-Avon. By Dr. H. A. W. Speckman. Publishers: L. E. Bosch & Zoon, Utrecht.

A most interesting and illuminative brochure of 16pp. and wrapper, reprinted from a Dutch journal, in which is contained a cryptographic deciphering of the inscription on the gravestone of Shakspeare at Stratford, and shewing that the prototype of the inscription itself was the double inscription on the funeral monument of Queen Semiramis at Babylon. Vigenère, in his *Traité des Chiffres* (1586) referred to this double inscription, and in the chapter on "Double Cypher," concealed in the French version of the text of this inscription, by the letter transposition method of Cæsar and Trithemius, the significant announcement "Fr. Baconus Fecit Opus." By the same method of employing the first letters of words as "secret" letters, or clues to the anagram, can a similar revelation be brought out of the inscription of the Stratford gravestone, viz., "R.S. Fr. Baconus est Shakespeare." And Dr. Speckman shews also, that by the three different kinds of type or letters of the inscription, as printed by Samuel Ireland in *Picturesque Views on the Upper Avon* (London, 1792) the further cypher has been concealed: "Mag. Fr. Bacon est Shakespeare et edit."

American Baconiana (double number), Vol. I., No. 3, Bacon Society of America, National Arts Club, 15, Gramercy Park, New York City, U.S.A. One dollar.

We have received the third issue of the *American Baconiana*, which is brim full of the most interesting material. A frontispiece of the late Dr. Orville Ward Owen adorns the number, as well as a particularly interesting "Memoriam" contribution by Mrs. Gladys Owen Stewart (daughter of Dr. Owen). Mr. Burrell F. Ruth also contributes "Recent Recollections" of Dr. Owen. A reprint of some letters of Francis Bacon to Count Gondomar is given prominence, and one, just after the "fall" is particularly striking, of which the following is an extract: "Now that at once my age, my fortunes, and my genius, to which I have hitherto done but scanty justice, call me from the stage of active life, I shall devote myself to letters, instruct the actors on it and serve posterity. In such a course I shall, perhaps, find honour. And I shall thus pass my life as within the verge of a better."

Dr. Speckman has a cryptographic article on the Monument of Francis Bacon at St. Albans, which is both interesting and lucid. His interpretation of the inscriptions is remarkable

and points to the conclusion that Bacon himself devised them. The anagram extracted to the effect that Bacon (when the Monument was erected by Meautys) was still alive, has much significance and Dr. Speckman says "there are indications that he lived for many years incognito and in retirement on the Continent, and was a most important factor in subsequent political events in England." There are also numerous photolithographic *facsimiles* of the typographical pages of the 1640 *Advancement of Learning* including the famous preface by Bacon which was not included in the Latin edition, *De Augmentis*, of 1623. General Hickson, also, has a bold and spirited article on "Francis Bacon, the Bell-Ringer," worthy of all contemplation. We regret that pressure of space precludes notice of the many other valuable contributions which this issue contains.

The "Shakespeare" Myth: a challenge. By Lord Sydenham of Combe and H. Crouch Batchelor. With a Foreword. Price 6d.

This is reprinted by permission from *The English Review*, and is an excellent pamphlet for Baconian propagandist purposes. The authors, in republishing this article, say, in the "Foreword," that their desire only is to distribute this challenge as widely as possible; and there is not the slightest doubt that the facts therein cited will arouse serious thought in the minds of those who have hitherto accepted the conventional view of the authorship of the Plays without giving a thought to the wild improbabilities which this involves.

The British Museum and Shakespeare's Identity. By John Denham Parsons, 45, Sutton Court Road, W.

This interesting pamphlet of twenty pages is an imaginary conversation of the author with the Trustees of the British Museum that really might have occurred, put into print as a result of their attitude towards certain facts relevant to the question of the identity of our national poet; with quotations from the actual communications between the Trustees and the author on such subject, together with some fresh evidence pointing to the existence of sub-surface signalling about the poet in the First Folio. To students of the Mathematical, or "Clocke" cypher, this pamphlet will be welcomed as containing no small amount of original research and calculation, which goes far to further establish, although incidentally, that Francis Bacon was the actual author of the "Shakespeare" plays. It also throws an interesting sidelight on the attitude assumed by the British Museum authorities in considering whether such an hypothesis deserves serious investigation. The "British Museum Shakespeare Exhibition 1923 Guide" comes in for a slating over an "exhibit" of the *Polimanteia*, by "W.C.,"

published in 1595. This important work (doubtless by Bacon) has been ascribed to William Covell, but other equally well-informed authorities have ascribed its authorship to William Clerke. It was issued soon after "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece" appeared and before any play had been issued by Shakespeare. It has a marginal reference to "sweet Shakspeare," not "Shakespeare," in its pages, for which reason it has been held to be the earliest reference, or one of the earliest references to the poet extant, who from other internal evidence was a graduate of Cambridge University. No wonder this book had been left unnoticed by the Stratfordians for 250 years, because by no manner of *hocus-focus* could it be shewn that the Stratford rustic was ever enrolled there, whereas Francis Bacon was. Concerning this exhibit the Trustees, in their worldly wisdom, say that "in labelling and describing the contents of a great Museum it is inevitable and reasonable that statements should be made embodying the generally accepted views on disputed matters." But how will posterity regard the Trustees?

A Reprint of England's Mourning Garment (Title-paged to Henry Chettle, 1603). Jenkins, James & Low, Park Street, Nottingham.

We have received this reprint of 26pp. from Mr. Parker Woodward, the author of its "Preliminary Note," and who is responsible for its re-publication. It is well worth the reading and betrays much internal evidence of being the work of Francis Bacon. In fact, it may well be regarded, hypothetically, as the "first draft" of the "Felicities of Queen Elizabeth" which Bacon left in MS., and, in his will, desired to have published posthumously. As Mr. Woodward points out, "the pastoral verses of Thenot and Collin are in close resemblance to those of Thenot and Collin in the pastoral verses of the *Shepherd's Kalendar* of 1579 (masked by Bacon in the name of Spenser)." The language throughout is characteristically Baconian, and the reprint should be read and studied by our readers.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

Since the last issue many communications have reached us with expressions of satisfaction at the lecture-reports therein and the various alleged Bacon cyphers incidentally unfolded. Bacon's predecessor in the style of acrostic-anagram signature displayed so obviously on the second page of *The Tempest* in the First Folio was undoubtedly Francesco Colonna, a monk who wrote in Venice in the year 1499, and was also a distinguished rhetorician. Of course, Bacon elaborated the method by one more secret and safe. An example is to be found in the First Folio, where the initial letters of the first lines of several consecutive plays reveal "Baconi," and "Francisci" by a reverse method, starting from the end and taking the initial letter of the last word of the first lines, the two names being joined by the double use of the final letter I, revealing an ingenious puzzle for the decipherer sufficiently acute.

Some time ago a rich American offered thousands of pounds for the beautifully carved double-oak panelling at Canonbury Tower—the "Compton Oak Room," now used by the Bacon Society's Council—but the owner respectfully declined it. Many English historical relics such as this have succumbed to the commercial spirit of the American prospector. Let us, in this connection, call attention to the excellent photographic reproduction of the room which is presented as a supplement with this number, and which, we think, has been creditably executed. For it should ever be borne in mind that this wonderful woodwork of the Elizabethan period is quite unique as well as old. Recently it has been carefully restored and repaired, here and there, to make the panelling complete, without any stint of cost in money. Unless we are much mistaken, the total cost of the restoration of the Tower must have run into an enormous figure, and the public owes a debt of gratitude to the public spirit thus shown by the late noble Earl of Northampton in leaving such a valuable historical legacy. Archæologists agree that the Tower, as one of the most stately of Tudor buildings yet remaining to us, is comparable to few others. Furthermore, its interest to Baconians is enhanced by the fact that it was once Francis Bacon's residence, and that he was living there when he received the appointment of Lord Chancellor. Of all the fitting places in London for a society dedicated to Bacon's memory to hold its meetings there can be none better than this splendid room, in which it is said that he wrote the latter-day plays, culminating in *The Tempest*, which, although first in the great Folio, was written last.

Over 20,000 books have been published, since the famous controversy arose, for and against the Baconian authorship of the great Plays, and yet another is on the cards, a very important book from the press of Gay and Hancock, entitled *Shakespeare's Plays and Poems*, by Basil E. Lawrence, LL.D., at 15s. net. Note, please, that the postage is sevenpence in addition. So many books on the same subject have been issued in recent years that it may be said that the subject has been well-nigh threshed out, but from the preliminary sheets this work is a scholarly production of importance as well as of controversial value. Argument of the convincing kind is carried on within its pages in a manner both masterful and rare. It is, indeed, well worthy a place in every Baconian library, and it is printed artistically.

BACONIANA will be issued three times this year in all probability, if members' subscriptions do not lag. Efforts, at any rate, will be made by the Society to achieve that objective, in the hope of reverting to the original quarterly publication, which may soon become certain. Really, we are now making very good progress, after arduous work by a few enthusiasts, particularly during and after the War, who stuck to the work and have continued to do so in the past few years. Perhaps the journal may become self-supporting in the course of time. It is certainly increasing in circulation. Many people are beginning to take an interest in the subject, and additional members will render the task easy. The educated public are perhaps shewing the keenest interest in our work, and we earnestly welcome their active help. Of course, we rejoice at our gradually increasing membership and a good (if not a princely) balance in hand, so unlike the old days. Surely we have good reason for further enthusiasm and interest.

How much or how little will be discovered of Bacon's private papers by Dr. C. Moor in the thirty odd chests at Gorhambury which at the instance of Lady Verulam he has undertaken to inspect and search for possible discoveries, remains to be seen, but it is doubtful if any literary MSS. will be exhumed. Recently, it was ascertained that the late Lord Verulam had found some original playbills of the Elizabethan Globe Theatre amongst other surviving documents, which has awakened no little interest to Bacon enthusiasts. Doubtless, the literary MSS. were hidden elsewhere, if credence may be placed on the various cyphers which Bacon has left in numerous of his works, or otherwise indicated. Seemingly, these will be brought to light in good time, although concealed, meanwhile, for good cause. Let us

all work for the dawn of the psychological moment, when all the bitterness of polemics will be over. Such is our word of encouragement

H. S.

[*Note*.—The reference in the first note herein to Colonna's method may be better illustrated by a simple example. If, therefore, the reader places in a row the initial letters both of the first and last words in each complete sentence of this batch of notes, and then divides these letters into the words which they consecutively reveal, he will catch the idea, and find the solution of the earliest cross-word puzzle extant.]

"Whether Bacon wrote the wonderful plays or not, I am quite sure the man Shakspeare neither did nor could."—*John G. Whittier*.

"I can't help anticipating that, some of these days, Bacon letters or other papers will turn up, interpretive of his, at present, dark phrase to Sir John Davies of 'your concealed poet.' We have noble contemporary poetry, unhappily anonymous, and I shall not be surprised to find Bacon the concealed singer of some of it. May I live to have my expectation verified."—*Alexander B. Grosart*.

"It is desperately hard, nay, impossible to believe that this uninstructed, untutored youth, as he came from Stratford, should have written these plays; and almost as hard, as it seems to me, to believe that he should have rendered himself capable of writing them by elaborate study afterwards. . . . The difficulty of imagining this young man to have converted himself in a few years from a state bordering on ignorance into a deeply-read student, master of French and Italian, as well as of Greek and Latin, and capable of quoting and borrowing largely from writers in all these languages, is almost insuperable. . . . His name once removed from the controversy, there will not, I think, be much question as to the lawyer to whose pen the Shakespeare plays are to be attributed."—*Lord Penzance*.